

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, our Father in Heaven, that we are permitted to bow at the altar of prayer. For at Thy mercy seat burdens are rolled away; at Thy touch we have gone on our way rejoicing. In all our problems we need Him who taught us the spirit of good will and how to make beautiful the thresholds of home, school, and church. We thank Thee for the providential blessings of happy firesides, for social delights, for friendships, and for all those satisfactions and joys of a just and worthy life. We praise Thee for this radiant day. O, happy is he who looks up through the fluttering leaves and sees God's love, who sees the bright depths of the deep blue sky and feels that it is a canopy of blessing; may we look deeper and feel that an infinite God is at the heart of all. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9185. An act to insure the collection of the revenue on intoxicating liquor, to provide for the more efficient and economical administration and enforcement of the laws relating to the taxation of intoxicating liquor, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House thereon, and appoints Mr. KING, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CROSS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROSS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, far to the southwest on this side of the Rio Grande is a vast empire called Texas. The Colorado and Brazos, the two main rivers of that region, rise in New Mexico and find their way to the Gulf through the great central agricultural basin of the State. The Brazos in crossing Texas traverses some 900 miles before reaching the Gulf, while the Colorado does approximately the same. The drainage area of the Brazos is 44,600 square miles, while that of the Colorado is 41,500, the two together being an area more than twice as large as the State of Ohio. And within their watersheds is 40 percent of the population of the State, or some 2,400,000 people. The valleys that flank these streams are unsurpassed in fertility. They are dotted with many thousands of farms, and upon which depends the prosperity of hundreds of towns and cities. These streams on an average of every 5 years are subject to devastating floods, submerging between three and five million acres of land and causing the loss of many lives, as well as the destruction of untold millions of dollars in livestock and crops, to say nothing of the enormous damage resulting from erosion and soil depletion.

For many years not only the people, the cities and towns that depend upon the products of these rich valleys for support, but all Texas has looked to the day when these floods would be controlled and the frightful loss of life and property brought to an end. Before applying to governmental agencies for a loan to construct the necessary dams to control these floods so destructive of life and property, the State, in order to show its good faith and to demonstrate beyond any question that these projects would be self-liquidating, in the case of the Brazos project passed an act setting aside

the taxes to accrue from 10 counties over a period of 20 years to be added to the money to be obtained from the sale of hydroelectric energy to be generated at these dams, while an act was also passed by the legislature in the interest of the Colorado project. With such showings, both applications were promptly approved.

Texas was thrilled by this good news, for it was not only to result in the employment of thousands whose families were in dire need of food and clothing but it also meant the coming true of a dream long and devoutly wished. But this exaltation was fated to turn into the gall of bitter disappointment through the greed-impelled, selfish activities of a great monopolistic holding company domiciled at 2 Rector Street, New York, in ordering its puppet officials of the power companies in Texas to hide themselves 2,000 miles away to the city of Washington and to file in the Federal court of this district an injunction suit to restrain and prevent the governmental agencies from making these loans on the ground that it would result in hydro-electric energy generated at these flood-control dams coming in competition with their unconscionable monopolistic rates, contrary, as they claim, to the due process of law clause of the Constitution, and prayed that the court issue an injunction and thus permit these floods to continue uncontrolled to destroy the lives and property of the people in order that this monopolistic holding company might continue to enrich itself by collecting exorbitant tribute from the users of electricity.

Mr. Speaker, the lamented Will Rogers, the great philosopher-humorist, who constantly spoke as one inspired, declared: "A holding company is just like a fence that holds the stolen booty while the actual thieves escape from the law."

Mr. Speaker, in other words, a holding company is a corporate pirate devised by high-financiering buccaneers that neither produces, distributes, nor performs any necessary service, but under our dual system of government furnishes an ideal device for the monopolization of public utilities, enabling a few men with but little investment, by interlocking directors and manipulating through a chain of so-called holding companies to control and milk producing companies, and in so doing collect exorbitant tribute from the people. And this money, though sorely needed to do the money work in the communities where the power plant operates, is daily transported to some distant city where the holding company and its brood of alias subholding companies are domiciled.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Trade Commission, after several years of delving into the mysteries of these holding and subholding companies, has revealed the fact that almost without exception the master minds that control and manipulate these devices are those great captains of finance, the Morgans and Mellons, the Du Ponts, and Rockefellers.

Since the Texas Power & Light Co. which operates in my district is non-hydraulic and the rates charged by it are comparable to those charged by other power companies controlled by holding companies throughout the Nation, I am going to use this company to illustrate to you what the power companies that operate in your districts are doing to your constituents.

That superholding company, the Electric Bond & Share with its four monster sub-holding companies, the American & Foreign Power & Light, the American Power & Light, the National Power & Light, and the Electric Light & Power Corporation, are all domiciled at 2 Rector Street, New York, and are controlled and manipulated by the house of Morgan. The first named operates in foreign countries, while the three latter confine their activities exclusively to this country, controlling power or producing companies in 36 of the States.

These sub-holding companies are only so many corporate aliases for Electric Bond & Share, by means of which it juggles water into controlling stock and fictitious loans into mortgage bonds in order to build up a stupendous, fraudulent rate base.

So in presenting the Texas Power & Light Co. as a typical example of what happens when a holding company controls a power or producing company, and in order to simplify and



avoid confusion wherever the Electric Bond & Share holding company acts through an alias sub-holding company, I shall use the name of the holding company, the Electric Bond & Share.

The thriving and prosperous cities of Temple, Waco, Hillsboro, Waxahachie, Cleburne, Sherman, and Bonham are located in seven of the State's banner agricultural black-land counties. In the latter part of 1911 the Electric Bond & Share Co. purchased the power plants in these cities and in the early part of 1912 organized and secured a charter from the State for the Texas Power & Light Co. The Electric Bond & Share holding company paid for these seven properties as shown by the records furnished to the Federal Trade Commission \$2,065,000. The Electric Bond & Share further claimed that including certain moneys it had advanced, together with the cost of the options and the securing of the Texas Power & Light Co.'s charter, it was out an additional \$325,000, making these properties cost it all told \$2,390,000.

The Electric Bond & Share then conveyed these properties to its creature, the Texas Power & Light Co., and had its Punch and Judy officers and directors to pay for them by issuing not \$2,390,000 in stock, but \$1,500,000 in debentures or promissory lien notes, drawing 6 percent; 1,000 non-voting shares, \$100 par value, totaling \$1,000,000; 1,610,000 common or voting shares, \$5 a share no par value, totaling \$8,050,000, or a grand total of \$10,550,000. And so, not \$2,390,000, but \$10,550,000, was entered upon the books of the Texas Power & Light Co. as the cost of these properties and formed the base upon which to fix the rates that consumers of electricity were to pay, instead of \$2,390,000.

The Electric Bond & Share Co. then sold to the people of Texas this \$1,000,000 of 7-percent preferred stock and also disposed of the \$1,500,000 of 6-percent debentures—making \$2,500,000—and so got back the \$2,390,000 that it had paid out, and had plus a bonus of \$110,000, plus \$8,050,000 of common stock carrying complete control of the Texas Power & Light Co. that had cost the Electric Bond & Share Co. \$110,000 less than nothing.

The Electric Bond & Share Co. then had its puppet officials of the Texas Power & Light Co. to execute a so-called service contract, whereby the Electric Bond & Share Co. is to employ for the Texas Power & Light Co. all bookkeepers, adjusters, accountants, and engineers. That provides that the Texas Power & Light Co. is to pay to these employees such sums for their services as the Electric Bond & Share sees fit to designate. It further provides that in the case of all sums paid by the Texas Power & Light Co. to bookkeepers, adjusters, and accountants, the Texas Power & Light Co. is to pay 50 percent of that sum, or one-half of that amount, to the Electric Bond & Share Co. And that in the case of all sums paid out for engineering service, 90 percent over and above that must be paid to the Electric Bond & Share. So that if the Texas Power & Light Co. pays \$20,000 to bookkeepers, adjusters, and accountants, it must then pay \$10,000 to the Electric Bond & Share Co., making this service cost the Texas Power & Light Co. \$30,000. If the Texas Power & Light Co. pays out the sum of \$20,000 to employees for engineering services, the Texas Power & Light must pay \$18,000 to the Electric Bond & Share, making this service cost the Texas Power & Light Co. \$38,000. And these sums are entered upon the books of the Texas Power & Light Co. as operating cost and go into the rate base. So that the more the Electric Bond & Share Co. requires the Texas Power & Light Co. to pay these employees, the more the Electric Bond & Share Co. gets from this source out of the Texas Power & Light, and the higher the rate base of the Texas Power & Light Co. is inflated.

This so-called service contract further provides that the Texas Power & Light Co. is to turn over to the Electric Bond & Share Co. 1½ percent of its gross revenues monthly. And this is entered on the books of the Texas Power & Light Co. as operating expense.

And then this holding company, the Electric Bond & Share, organized the Texas Construction Co., domiciled in its offices at 2 Rector Street, New York, the stock of which

is exclusively owned by the Electric Bond & Share, and to which all contracts for improvements and extensions by the Texas Power & Light Co. are to be let without competition, and with no other check except the tender conscience of the Electric Bond & Share. And however exorbitant these charges may be, they go on the books of the Texas Power & Light Co. as capital invested and inflate the rate base.

Mr. Speaker, the sole purpose of holding companies in the field of public utilities is to monopolize and by controlling producing companies to enrich themselves by forcing the consumers of electricity to pay exorbitant rates. This is done first by increasing the rate base through inflating the capital structure of the producing companies with watered stock and, second, by giving fictitious values through write-ups to their physical properties.

In this company I am using as a typical example, the Texas Power & Light Co., and in which the first big swindle took place immediately after it was organized by the Electric Bond & Share, when there was a write-up from \$2,390,000 to \$10,550,000. These write-ups have been continued from time to time, and markedly so whenever the Electric Bond & Share had additional plants under its control transferred to this producing company. So that these original properties, together with the additions, as a result of these write-ups, are valued at more than \$80,000,000. And as these producing companies under the control of the Electric Bond & Share holding company were transferred to the Texas Power & Light Co., a sufficient amount of non-voting preferred stock was sold to the people of Texas to reimburse the holding company, the Electric Bond & Share, whatever sums it had been out plus a block of vote-carrying common stock as a bonus. As a result the people in Texas have invested \$6,500,000 in 7-percent preferred stock and \$6,878,600 of 6-percent preferred stock, making \$13,378,600, and which is destined to be wiped out by the foreclosure of the fictitious bonded indebtedness. To anyone who is familiar with the properties of this company and their actual value, it is patent that the people in Texas who put up this \$13,378,600, through the purchase of preferred stock, have furnished every dollar that has actually gone into them and that no benefit accrued to the Texas Power & Light Co. as a result of this bonded indebtedness, but that it enriched the coffers of the Electric Bond & Share holding company to the detriment of the preferred stockholders and the consumers of electricity.

Now, in order to make the assets comparable to the liabilities—that is, to the capital stock of \$33,443,976, more than \$20,000,000 of which was manufactured out of water, carrying 100-percent control in the hands of the holding company, and the bonded indebtedness of \$45,405,000 as well as other indebtedness—a number of sky-high write-ups of the physical properties of this company had to be made, until the company's statement in December 1934 shows its physical properties valued at \$86,104,472. And this enormous sum resting on fictitious values becomes the rate base on the theory that it represents capital invested and upon which the courts hold the company is entitled to a reasonable return.

The only period for which the Securities and Exchange Commission has data showing the amount of dividends paid on common and preferred stock covers the 6 years from 1929 to 1934, inclusive, which were depression years. And for that 6-year period the holding company received as dividends on its common water bonus stock \$8,400,000, while the holders of the preferred stock, who paid for it their good hard-earned money, only received \$4,734,349.

Thus the holding company, the Electric Bond & Share, receives practically twice as much in dividends on its water-bonus stock as the preferred-stock holders who put up their hard-earned money. Then add to the holding company's watered stock dividends its exorbitant profits accruing from the Texas Construction Co., plus its so-called service-contract profits, plus interest on many millions of pretended loans, and you have a concrete example of holding-company high financiering. This is one of the smaller of the many, many producing companies controlled by the Electric Bond



& Share holding company and used by it as a tribute collector from the consumers of electricity.

While comparisons may be odious, I am going to give you one which at least furnishes food for thought. The little town of Garland, with some 1,500 population, in Congressman SUMNER's district, has a small municipal plant and ships its fuel several hundred miles, from Oklahoma. This fact, in addition to its being a one-unit plant, makes its overhead extremely high. It is true that this little plant is not assessed for taxes, but it is also true that it furnishes to

the city in services several times what the taxes would amount to, for it not only pumps the water that supplies the city free but in addition furnishes all municipal and street lights free, and it is known as the best lighted town of its size in Texas. This little plant clears, as shown by data furnished by the city secretary, between four and five thousand dollars a year. The following is a comparison of the rates charged by this little municipal plant to the citizens in Garland with the rates charged the citizens of Killeen, a town of similar size, by the Texas Power & Light Co.:

ELECTRIC RATE SURVEY—TEXAS  
TABLE 1—Typical net monthly bills, residential service, Jan. 1, 1935

Line	Community	Population	Name of company or municipal utility serving community: (I) indicates independent operating company; (C) company controlled by a utility holding company or other operating utility; (M) municipally owned and operated utility)	Lighting and small appliances					Lighting, small appliances, and refrigeration		Lighting, refrigeration, cooking, etc., 250 kilowatt-hours	Lighting, refrigeration, cooking, water heating, etc., 500 kilowatt-hours	Average charge per kilowatt-hour				Line
				Minimum bill		15 kilowatt-hours	25 kilowatt-hours	40 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours	150 kilowatt-hours			25 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours	250 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours	
				Amount	Kilowatt-hours included												
1	Garland.....	1,534	Garland Light & Power Co. (M).....	\$1.00	10	\$1.15	\$1.74	\$2.25	\$3.61	\$4.68	\$6.80	\$11.26	6.96	3.61	2.72	2.25	1
47	Killeen.....	1,260	Texas Power & Light Co. (C).....	1.50	7	2.00	2.60	3.35	5.95	7.45	8.75	13.75	10.40	5.95	3.50	2.75	47

And this in spite of the fact that the Texas Power & Light Co.'s overhead is reduced to a minimum, distributing from a central generating plant located at its own fuel mine, to say nothing of the advantages in reduced prices of equipment that accrue to it as a result of buying in large quantities.

The money spent by the consumers of electricity in Garland remains in the community to do the money work of the community, while the money spent for electricity by the people of Killeen is exported more than 2,000 miles away to 2 Rector Street, New York.

If the Electric Bond & Share holding company had not gotten control of these properties and they had been controlled and managed by those who put the money in them, not only could their dividends and the wages of their employees been greatly increased, but the rates to the consumers of electricity reduced practically 50 percent, and the millions that are now annually exported to 2 Rector Street, New York, would remain in Texas. As it is the sum now taken out of Texas by the Electric Bond & Share through its three subholding companies, the American Power & Light, the National Power & Light, and the Electric Light & Power Corporation, over a period of 5 years, amounts approximately to what an entire year's cotton crop of the State will sell for.

Last year, during the consideration of the Wheeler-Rayburn or holding-company bill, propaganda reached an all-time high—with the holding companies pouring out millions, providing a heyday of golden prosperity for lobbyists. Washington swarmed with them of every hue and type, the friendship lobbyist, the social lobbyist, the political threatening lobbyist. Night after night men and women, posing as heads of high-sounding, memberless, fake organizations, repeated parrotlike, over a Nation-wide radio hook-up, speeches prepared by the \$60,000-a-year publicity agent of the holding companies, appealing to their victims upon whom they had unloaded so-called preferred stock to come to see, to write, or wire their Senators and Congressmen to vote against the bill or be ruined. You remember how we were swamped and flooded with telegrams identical in form, tens of thousands of which were shown by the Senate Committee on Lobbying to be forgeries; the evidence disclosing that some of the officials of the producing companies, the creatures of the holding companies, had instructed their employees to take city directories and to forge all the names in them to telegrams and send them to Senators and Congressmen. It was developed later by the Sen-

ate Committee to Investigate Lobbying that instead of being against it, practically all of the people whose names were forged to these telegrams were ardently in favor of the bill. Under the Constitution, which specifically provides that our constituents shall have the right to petition us expressing their views on legislation, in committing these forgeries, the officials of these holding companies, acting through their puppet officials of producing companies, were committing forgeries in the very shadow of treason. While then as now we heard their hypocritical wails that if Congress passed this bill and choked them loose from their victim it would be a violation of the Constitution. And many members of the legal profession, who put self above patriotism and "crook the pregnant hinges of the knee where thrift might follow faunting", joined in the wail.

As a result of the investigations of the Federal Trade Commission, of the House and Senate Lobby Investigating Committees, as well as the hearings on the Wheeler-Rayburn bill before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which was so ably assisted by their attorney, Dr. Splawn, we now know what methods these holding companies have pursued in so long throttling any laws being enacted that would materially interfere with their carrying on this Nation-wide racket of rackets. We now know it was the result of carefully fostered powerful political influences, for these hearings reveal the fact that they not only managed to get much of the preferred stock into the hands of prominent influential men, including outstanding ministers of the gospel, but also wherever possible they would unload a block of it upon some organization that might be used in putting pressure upon legislative bodies to defeat any bill that would tend to prevent their hijacking manipulations, as was done by the Texas Power & Light Co. when it unloaded such a block on the Texas Federation of Women's Clubs. We know now how the press was to be kept friendly by instructions sent out to the puppet officials of producing companies to run extended ads in all the local papers, and, as stated in the instructions, that it was not for the purpose of selling electricity, but to silence and keep down criticism.

While a fearless independent press is the food upon which liberty feeds and grows, a subsidized press is to it a most deadly poison.

And we know, too, from these lobbying investigations the tactics their speakers were instructed to use in addressing chambers of commerce, luncheon clubs, and other organizations. And then in rounding out their political set-up how zealous they are to place on their dummy boards of directors

men of outstanding political influence, such as the head of some great denominational institution. When such a man will permit himself to be used in this way to serve their purpose, the holding company sees to it that his picture appears on the front page of every newspaper in the section where that company operates, advertising it in box-car letters, to be paid for by the consumers of electricity, that he had been placed upon their board of directors. And though he is as ignorant of the power industry as the holding company is of God's plan of salvation, it tickles the one's vanity while strengthening the political set-up of the other.

But it was reserved for that super-holding company, the Electric Bond & Share, to conceive and promulgate that master plot of treachery that must have made angels weep and demons rejoice. The Lobby Investigation Committee of the Senate performed a glorious service for their country when they exposed this diabolical plan. Yes; it happened here, and is happening here today. Listen to the plan:

First, set up a militant organization of the security owners of America, with a "war chest" of something like \$200,000,000 for the purpose of destroying the New Deal. Second, "employ the services of the most astute political publicists and lobbyists to be found in the country." \* \* \* Third, demand "a congressional investigation of the 'brain trust' \* \* \* designed to expose it to public contempt." Fourth, start "a whispering campaign designed to create popular suspicion that the New Dealer in Chief is insane, discrediting him." Fifth, "liquidate the Federal Trade and Interstate Commerce Commissions." Sixth, set up a "program by private industry, acting through the United States Chamber of Commerce." Seventh, "engage outstanding national figures, such as Nicholas Murray Butler, Edwin S. Kemmerer, Newton D. Baker, and others, to act as mouthpieces and release publicity \* \* \* upon the middle-class citizenry." Seventh, "support in 1936 political campaign for President and congressional candidates, regardless of party, who pledge themselves to support the program of the security owners' organization."

And then incorporated in this plan is the declaration that there is nothing which would better serve the interest of the holding companies than the "putting over" of this program; and surely none will question that statement, as it would guarantee to them the economic and political dictatorship of the Nation, with the United States Chamber of Commerce playing the fiddle, while they collect tribute from some hundred and twenty-five millions of subjects.

This infamous program closes with these significant words: "The company as a company dare not be identified with the activity."

There you have their plan of battle and the objectives for which they have begun to fight, running in method and manner true to the plan. They have set up the militant organization, the Liberty League, with its affiliates, the Sentinels of the Republic, the Crusaders, the Farmers Independent Council, the Southern Committee to Uphold the Constitution, the Women Investors of America, and others—smoke-screens from behind which their paid hirelings are now howling. From the editorial and syndicated columns in the great metropolitan press it is evident that, as proposed, they have already employed the services of those "most astute publicists and propagandists" and ordered them into action.

And it is equally plain that from the harangues reeking with malicious exaggerations and concocted falsehoods coming nightly over the radio that their "outstanding national figures to be used as mouthpieces to release publicity upon the middle-class citizenry" have also "gotten theirs" and been ordered into action.

A whispering campaign, a contemptible, sneaking campaign of hell-born lies that our President was hopelessly insane in the vain hope that the people would be thrown into such a state of confusion and despair that they might work upon them their will and encompass his defeat. A whispering campaign to destroy the man who had saved them from the guillotine in having saved the country from

revolution. "Ingratitude, thou marble-hearted fiend", of all the devils men should hate thee most. But this den of Satan-inspired whispering serpents had hardly begun to hiss when the President's great heart-throbbing brain thrilled through the radio on the air and their foul whisperings abruptly ended.

How, too, in keeping with this whispering campaign as well as all of their undercover hidden manipulations is their closing admonition at the end of the plan: "Our company as a company dare not be identified with the activity."

That is the language of the master mind of racketeers, of an Al Capone, who stays under cover while others carry out his plans. And you, my colleagues, who voted for the conference report on the Wheeler-Rayburn bill are to be put on the spot on election day. Your political death is decreed in the holding company's program in this language: "Support in 1936 political campaign for President and congressional candidates, regardless of party, who pledge themselves to support the program of the security owners' organization." Your local utility officials may be loud in their protestations that they are for you while condemning your opponent, and in turn having him to denounce and excoriate holding companies, and so, by this double-crossing process, enable him to split a vote that would otherwise be yours, while getting theirs a hundred percent. But do not be deceived, my colleagues, for you are marked for slaughter, and if money can defeat you, you will be defeated.

It was indeed an evil day for you, my friends of the minority, when Du Pont and his "gang" set up the Liberty League and its satellites to act as holding companies for your party, for its embrace means death. And so you will find this Liberty League is not only a holding company, with all the knavery that word implies, but that it is also a political undertaker which is even now digging a grave wide and deep for the Republican elephant, a grave of shame and dishonor, over which is to be erected in November a monument with this brief epitaph carved upon it: "Here lies the last remains of the G. O. P., another sad victim of holding companies." And as you, in your political rags, biannually gather about it with heavy hearts and in your anguish cry out, "When, oh, when will his resurrection come?" Perched on that monument a croaking raven, the Liberty Leagues' evil spirit, will respond, "Never, never more."

#### PRINTING OF RULES AND MANUAL OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution, House Resolution 519, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### House Resolution 519

*Resolved*, That the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the Seventy-fifth Congress be printed as a House document and that 1,600 additional copies shall be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives, of which 700 copies shall be bound in leather with thumb index and delivered as may be directed by the Parliamentarian of the House for distribution to officers and Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### IMPORTATION OF TEXTILES FROM JAPAN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from Mr. Russell Fisher, of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.



The letter referred to is as follows:

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COTTON MANUFACTURERS,  
Boston, Mass., May 19, 1936.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The flood of Japanese cotton goods increases month by month, making it very obvious that the "gentlemen's agreement" effected by the State Department is wholly inadequate. March figures, now available, show an increase of nearly one-third over February, and bring the total for the first quarter to 21,530,436 square yards compared to a total of 12,769,579 square yards for the same period in 1935.

If the imports continue to increase, and apparently nothing is being done to stop them, by the end of the year the volume will be more than double the figure for 1935.

For comparison it should be pointed out that imports from Japan for the first quarter of 1936 are more than 20 times the annual average for the years 1930 to 1933. It would seem that official Washington might well give some attention to the unemployment this is creating, particularly now that the cost of relief is mounting to such staggering figures.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) RUSSELL T. FISHER.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this letter shows the tremendous increase of cotton-textile imports from Japan in March as compared with February of this year. It shows 20 times the cotton-textile imports into this country at the present time over what they were in 1930-33.

Mr. Speaker, many of us have been taking up the matter with the Department of State, in view of the very alarming situation. I have been in almost daily communication with the Department about it. Only yesterday I received the following letter from Secretary of State Hull, which shows just how weak our position is:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, May 19, 1936.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I am returning herewith telegrams addressed to you by the Waterhead Mills, Inc., and Boot Mills, both of Lowell, Mass., with reference to imports of cotton textiles from Japan. These telegrams have been referred to me by the President with the request that I communicate directly with you.

As you know, this Government has been giving careful attention to the problem of imports of Japanese cotton textiles for some months. In accordance with the recommendations made last year by the Cabinet committee on the cotton-textile industry, an effort was made to secure a voluntary undertaking by Japanese exporters to limit shipments of cotton cloth to the United States to reasonable amounts. Such an assurance was transmitted to this Government through the Japanese Ambassador on December 21, 1935. It was the opinion of the Japanese Government, in view of this assurance, that there was little likelihood of such abnormal increase in exports of cotton textiles to the United States as had occurred during the first 6 months of 1935.

When the statistics of imports for the first months of 1936 became available, it appeared that these expectations had not been well-founded, inasmuch as imports showed a considerable increase. This Department promptly brought the facts to the attention of the Japanese Ambassador as soon as the January figures were available.

Conversations have been continued, with the approval of the President, and there is now expectation that a more definite, adequate, and satisfactory undertaking for the voluntary limitation of cotton-textile exports from Japan to the United States may be received. A few minor details remain to be clarified, but I expect that it may be possible to announce the conclusion of these negotiations in the very near future.

I also understand that the Tariff Commission is proceeding with an investigation of cotton velveteens under its general powers as provided in section 322 of the tariff act. When completed, this report should give a complete picture of the situation with regard to this particular product.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Just another "gentleman's agreement" with Japan! The previous one was nothing but a farce, and to date we have nothing but promises and expectations. Japan looks upon us as spineless jellyfish, and obviously they think that because we do not show resentment they can do as they please.

The time has passed for playing with gentleman's agreements. We must have something binding, something that will protect our workers. We are tired of promises that are never fulfilled. It is the old cry of "mañana, mañana", but tomorrow never comes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

PASSAGE OF THE WAGNER-ELLENBOGEN HOUSING BILL IS NECESSARY TO PROMOTE FURTHER RECOVERY, REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT, AND SECURE DECENT HOUSING

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address made by my colleague, Mr. ELLENBOGEN, of Pennsylvania, over the radio last evening.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by Congressman HENRY ELLENBOGEN, of Pittsburgh, Pa., over National Broadcasting System (Blue Network) Tuesday, May 19, 1936:

Nearly 6,000,000 people have been reemployed in the United States since March 1933, but about 10,000,000 people are still unemployed. How does this come about and what can we do to reduce substantially the number of jobless?

ALL BRANCHES OF INDUSTRY EXCEPT BUILDING HAVE HAD SUBSTANTIAL RECOVERY

The consumer-goods industries—industries which manufacture goods for immediate consumption—have had extensive recovery. The automobile industry is operating near capacity and turning out almost as many millions of cars as it did during the boom days. Even the heavy- and durable-goods industries have made substantial recovery and seem to be progressing rapidly. Steel, for instance, is now operating at about 70 percent of its theoretical capacity.

THE BUILDING INDUSTRY IS STILL IN THE DEPTH OF THE DEPRESSION

One industry is lagging behind—lagging behind so far that it cannot even be seen in the recovery parade. That industry is the building industry. If you consider the fact that nearly 5,000,000 people are directly and indirectly depending on the building industry, and if you further consider the deplorable low state of operations in that industry, you will find the most important reason why we still have 10,000,000 unemployed.

Taking only 257 cities—not the whole country, but only 257 large cities—we find that from 1923 to 1928, inclusive, total building operations in the United States amounted to between three and one-half and four billion dollars every year. But in 1935 they amounted to only \$655,213,410, or about 20 percent of normal operations. If we consider only the building of homes in these 257 cities, we find normal building operations varying between two and two and one-half billion dollars every year from 1923 to 1928, whereas in 1935 they amounted to \$211,987,850, or only a little over 10 percent of normal.

EIGHTY PERCENT OF THE BUILDING TRADES WORKERS ARE UNEMPLOYED

A few weeks ago, Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, appearing before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, on behalf of the Wagner-Ellebenbogen housing bill testified that in 1929 there were 2,091,000 gainfully employed workers in the construction industry of which about 11 percent were unemployed in that year, but that throughout 1935 out of these 2,000,000 workers 1,732,383 or about 85 percent were unemployed. From 1930 to 1936 unemployment in the building-trade industry fluctuated from 70 to 85 percent. Just think of it! Here is an industry upon which 5,000,000 people depend directly and indirectly for employment—an industry which still has an unemployment record of about 80 percent. These figures tell the story.

HOUSING SHORTAGE—10,000,000 NEW HOMES NEEDED IN THE NEXT 10 YEARS

Recovery cannot advance any further unless we have substantial recovery in the building industry; and there can be no revival of the building industry unless we engage upon a large-scale program of the construction of homes.

There is today an acute shortage of decent housing. Consider the fact that we have annually an increase of 500,000 new families, consider the obsolescence of existing buildings, the normal demand for replacement, the destruction of buildings by fire and other factors. The best estimate available is that we must build during the next 10 years at least 10,000,000 new homes in the United States.

PASSAGE OF THE WAGNER-ELLENBOGEN HOUSING BILL NECESSARY

The bill introduced in the United States Senate by Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, and in the United States House of Representatives by myself is the answer to the twin problem of unemployment and the shortage of decent, sanitary homes.

Of course, we do not contend that subsidized housing provided for in the bill will construct all the necessary homes. We feel that the construction of homes for families of low income, subsidized in part by the Government, will stimulate the private construction industry as it did in England.

I feel that the Wagner-Ellebenbogen bill will remove the tragedy of need amidst plenty, the tragedy which exists when millions of decent homes are needed, while the building-trades workers who would build these homes are available but must live, or rather exist, in enforced idleness.



Carpenters, bricklayers, electricians, mechanics, and other skilled workers look for jobs in vain. Several million people depend directly and indirectly on the building industry for employment. Warehouses and lumber yards are bulging with needed material. Industrial plants, which could supply other needed building materials, are lying idle. At the same time millions of families are forced to live in slums or blighted areas which shut them off from light, sunshine, and hope. But nothing is done. Nothing is done to give employment, to stimulate construction activities, and to provide safe and sanitary homes that are so greatly needed. And I say to you that nothing will be done unless the Congress of the United States passes the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill.

The passage of that bill would supply the spark that would launch a gigantic construction program, that would begin a permanent revival of the building industry, and that would start our Nation toward still further recovery on a permanent basis.

#### THE FIGHT FOR DECENT HOUSING BEGAN IN 1900

The efforts of enlightened citizens to improve the housing conditions of our people goes back to the beginning of the century. In 1900 the first tenement law was passed in the State of New York. Ever since then the fight for good housing, for better housing, for decent, safe, and sanitary homes for families of low income has been carried on.

#### SLUMS BREED CRIME AND DISEASE

The United States has gradually awakened to the fact that slums and blighted areas are the breeders of crime and disease and that they are a tremendous burden upon the municipalities in the United States.

Mr. Ernest J. Bohn, member of the Cleveland city council and president of the National Association of Housing Officials, testified before the same Senate committee that an investigation by the city of Cleveland of a slum area which covered only 2½ percent of the population of the city showed that in that slum area 21 percent of the murders were committed, 26 percent of the houses of prostitution were located, 6.8 percent of all boy delinquencies arose in this area, 12½ percent of tubercular deaths occurred in it.

#### SLUMS ARE A BURDEN UPON CITY TREASURIES

The investigation by the city of Cleveland further showed that the total tax assessment against this area amounted to \$225,035—most of which was uncollectible—whereas the expenditure of the city for police, fire, health, school, and other municipal services amounted to \$1,971,000. Therefore, the city, even if it collected all taxes in that slum area, would have an annual loss of about \$1,746,000, a loss which must be borne by the home owners living in the other sections of the city every year. Similar conditions exist in hundreds of other cities in the United States.

In the city of New York the number of deaths from tuberculosis in the lower tenement houses is 220 percent higher than the deaths in the newer tenement houses. At the same time, deaths from spinal meningitis is 247 percent higher in the old tenement houses than in the new ones. Deaths from all causes is 87 percent higher in the old tenement houses than in the new ones. Juvenile delinquency is 100 percent higher in the slum areas than in the nonslum areas.

Why should we hold community and family welfare drives and permit the continuance of slum conditions which make such drives necessary? Why hold drives against the dreaded disease of tuberculosis when we force families of low income to live in homes where sunlight is shut out?

#### HOUSING EFFORTS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Realizing the need for the stimulation of employment in the building industry, the need for the abolition of slums and blighted areas, and the demand for new housing, the Federal Government, under Secretary Harold L. Ickes, P. W. A. Administrator, and his housing division, undertook 57 developments, providing about 26,000 dwelling units, with an allotment of \$141,000,000. Similarly, the suburban resettlement division was allotted \$31,000,000 with which it undertook to construct four low-cost-housing community developments.

#### PERMANENT POLICY AND PERMANENT AGENCY ARE NECESSARY

We now have the benefit of the tremendous amount of experience gathered and accumulated in the housing division of the P. W. A. and in the suburban resettlement division. We also know that low-cost housing cannot be undertaken under a temporary housing policy and a temporary housing agency. We must have a definite, a permanent housing policy and a permanent housing agency if we want to build low-rent housing in the United States.

#### THE WAGNER-ELLENBOGEN BILL IS THE RESULT OF LONG STUDY

As a result of the experience accumulated by these Government agencies and as a result of other experimentation, surveys, and thought on the part of all groups and individuals interested in finding some solution for the housing problem, we presented the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill to the Congress and to the people of the United States. We have moved slowly, because the problems involved are so serious and complex that no hasty or partial solution will do.

#### THIS BILL HAS WIDESPREAD SUPPORT

The Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill has the support and endorsement of the National Public Housing Conference; of the National Association of Housing Officials; of the churches. This

bill has the unanimous support and determined backing of the American Federation of Labor. Indeed, it has the unanimous support of all persons and individuals who have interested themselves in the problem of slum abatement and decent homes for families of low incomes.

The Wagner-Ellenbogen bill has been endorsed by large and small communities alike. It has been endorsed by the cities of New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Cleveland, Boston, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and other large cities. It has also been endorsed by hundreds of smaller communities like Kittanning, Pa.; Bethlehem, Pa.; Greenville, N. C.; and El Paso, Tex., and by many hundreds of small cities. There has never been a bill before the Congress of the United States which has received more widespread support among all classes and among all kinds of communities than the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill.

#### BILL PROTECTS PRIVATE INDUSTRY AGAINST GOVERNMENT COMPETITION

This bill protects private industry against competition from the Government, and at the same time provides subsidized housing with Federal aid for families of low incomes. It has received the acclaim not only of liberal and progressive newspapers, like the chain of Scripps-Howard newspapers, but it also has been approved by leading conservative newspapers throughout the country.

#### THIS BILL IS NONPARTISAN LEGISLATION

In its very essence this bill is nonpartisan legislation. The need for low-cost housing was recognized in Mr. Hoover's administration. The committee on large-scale operations of Mr. Hoover's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership reported that "the houses of the country constitute our largest mass of obsolete and discredited equipment." They pointed out that "new houses of acceptable standard of living are too expensive for two-thirds of the population", and they showed that "the present break-down in the financing, construction, and distribution of homes is more than a temporary or emergency situation" and therefore requires more than emergency measures for its solution.

The awakened local interest in the housing problem today knows no party line. What other issue can you find in which local governmental officials, both Democratic and Republican, social agencies, labor, consumer organizations, and the capital-goods industries are all united in seeking public action?

#### HOUSING SHOULD BE CROWNING ACHIEVEMENT OF ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION

The adoption of a sound national housing policy would be the crowning point of the first 4 years of the Roosevelt administration. Talk and experiment can now be translated into concrete achievement. The President has said, "We are working toward the ultimate objective of making it possible for American families to live as Americans should." Here is an economical, efficient, and comprehensive method of taking one real step in this direction.

How can we speak of an American standard of living when we find that millions of our people must live in slums and blighted areas, in crowded rooms without proper sanitary facilities, without adequate light and air, and without space for the children to play? How can we speak about a more abundant life if we refuse to provide the prime necessity of life—decent shelter?

#### EUROPE DID IT

From November 1918 to September 1935 England has built 1,231,992 homes with Government aid. At the same time a far larger and ever-increasing number of homes were built by private enterprise.

Holland rehoused about one-fifth of her population. Vienna did just as much. Germany before the advent of the Nazis erected more than 2,000,000 dwellings with Government aid. If we add up the housing achievements of several European countries with a combined population about equalling that of the United States, we find that they have built nearly 5,000,000 homes with government aid, with high standards of decency and comfort, and at prices and rentals available to low-income families.

Surely, what was done in Europe can be done in the United States.

#### A CRISIS HAS BEEN REACHED

Ladies and gentlemen, a crisis in the movement to revive the construction industry and to provide decent homes at low rentals has been reached in the Nation's Capital at Washington. Let me remind you that there is only one bill before the Congress which provides for housing, and that bill is the Wagner-Ellenbogen bill—a bill which contains the results of the effort, thought, and study which has been accumulated over a period of 35 years in the United States, a bill which contains the lessons which have been learned by the housing division of the P. W. A. and by the suburban resettlement division, lessons acquired at a cost of \$172,000,000.

#### LOW-COST HOUSING IS ENDED UNLESS THIS BILL PASSES

No further appropriation of funds for low-rent housing, no further construction of homes with Federal cooperation will be undertaken unless the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill is passed at this session of Congress. The housing movement in the United States, which seemed so near success, will be dead unless the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill becomes a law at this session of Congress. The housing division of the P. W. A. will fold up and the building of homes for families of low income will definitely end unless this bill is passed in substantially the form in which it has been introduced by Senator WAGNER and myself. Unless this bill is passed, the slums and blighted areas will remain with us and



will further increase. Millions of families of low incomes will continue to live miserably and the drain upon the treasuries of our cities will become unbearable.

#### SENATE EXPECTED TO PASS BILL

Senator WAGNER confidently expects the Senate Committee on Education and Labor to favorably report this bill to the Senate in the next few days, but the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, which has charge of the bill in the House, has so far refused to hold hearings on the bill.

The Members of Congress are your representatives. They are your servants. Ladies and gentlemen, if you want to give health and well-being to the coming generation, do your part for the passage of this bill. If you want to provide the necessary push for further and complete recovery, if you want to aid in the clearance of slums and the elimination of crime and disease, if you want to establish a cleaner and more healthy atmosphere for the mothers of America to watch over their children, you will aid in the passage of the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill.

The passage of the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill will give to the children of America the opportunity to grow up to a better life and to a more promising maturity, and it will permit the parents in America to live in decency and comfort amidst sanitary and healthy homes full of light and sunshine.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 10630) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Since practically the appropriation on every item in this bill has been increased on the insistence of the managers on the part of the Senate, I think the membership of the House should be present to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I therefore make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 104]

Adair	Dempsey	Kee	Petengill
Allen	Dietrich	Keller	Powers
Andrew, Mass.	Dingell	Kelly	Quinn
Andrews, N. Y.	Dirksen	Kennedy, Md.	Rabaut
Beam	Dorsey	Kerr	Reilly
Berlin	Doutch	Kopplemann	Richardson
Blinderup	Duncan	Lee, Okla.	Risk
Brennan	Eagle	Lehlbach	Rogers, N. H.
Brooks	Eaton	Lesinski	Rogers, Okla.
Brown, Mich.	Fenerty	Lewis, Md.	Russell
Buckley, N. Y.	Ferguson	Lord	Ryan
Bulwinkle	Gambrill	Lundeen	Sadowski
Caldwell	Gasque	McGroarty	Sanders, La.
Cartwright	Gifford	McKeough	Sandlin
Cary	Goldsborough	McLean	Schaefer
Casey	Goodwin	Maloney	Sears
Cavichia	Gray, Pa.	Meeks	Seger
Chandler	Green	Mitchell, Tenn.	Starnes
Chapman	Gwynne	Montet	Steagall
Claiborne	Hancock, N. C.	Moritz	Stewart
Clark, N. C.	Harter	Nelson	Sweeney
Connery	Hartley	Norton	Turpin
Cooley	Hill, Ala.	Oliver	Utterback
Creal	Hoeppel	O'Malley	Wearin
Crosby	Hook	Palmsano	Wilcox
Crowther	Hope	Perkins	Zioncheck
Dear	Hahn	Peterson, Fla.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLMER). Three hundred and nineteen Members are present, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. BANKHEAD, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the statement of the managers on the part of the House. The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10630) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 26, 27, 40, 51, 60, 64, 79, 90, and 91.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 6, 12, 13, 20, 22, 23, 25, 28, 29, 30, 34, 37, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 55, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 88, and 89, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for work on any figure, in addition to the four figures authorized by law, upon which work has not commenced as of the date of enactment of this Act", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$587,700", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$77,500", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$160,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$75,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "\$159,200, of which amount \$10,000 shall be immediately available", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$260,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$356,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "\$2,375,000, of which amount \$10,000 shall be immediately available", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$140,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$75,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$2,807,817", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$2,093,200", and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 7, 24, 31, 32, 33, 35, 39, 46, 50, 52, 53, 54, 56, 83, and 87.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,

B. M. JACOBSEN,

JED JOHNSON,

W. P. LAMBERTSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,

KENNETH MCKELLAR,

ELMER THOMAS,

FREDERICK STEIWER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the



Senate to the bill (H. R. 10630) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

On no. 2: Provides a salary of \$5 per diem and for the payment of necessary travel expenses, exclusive of subsistence, for members of advisory committees of local stockmen, in connection with the administration of the Grazing Control Act, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5 per diem while actually employed in lieu of subsistence and 5 cents per mile for travel, as proposed by the House.

On nos. 3 and 4, relating to the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission: Makes \$30,000 immediately available, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$50,000, as proposed by the House, and accepts the House prohibition against the expenditure of funds on any figure on which work has not been commenced with the further provision that no funds shall be expended on any additional figure not authorized by law.

#### GENERAL LAND OFFICE

On no. 5: Appropriates \$587,700 for salaries in the Office of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, instead of \$577,700, as proposed by the House, and \$600,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On no. 6: Appropriates \$700,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$600,000, as proposed by the House, for surveying public lands.

On no. 8: Appropriates \$77,500 for salaries of registers of district land offices instead of \$75,000, as proposed by the House, and \$80,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On no. 9: Appropriates \$160,000 for contingent expenses of land offices instead of \$150,000, as proposed by the House, and \$175,000, as proposed by the Senate.

#### BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

On no. 10: Appropriates \$75,000 for the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors among Indians instead of \$55,880, as proposed by the House, and \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On no. 11: Appropriates \$159,200 for lease, purchase, and repair of agency buildings instead of \$144,200, as proposed by the House, and \$164,200, as proposed by the Senate, and provides that \$10,000 of such sum shall be immediately available, instead of \$20,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On no. 12: Eliminates proviso proposed by the House limiting the amount payable to attorneys serving in connection with claims of the Sioux Indians to 5 percent of the total recovery.

On no. 13: Provides that no part of the funds made available for the purchase of lands under the act of June 18, 1934, shall be available for the acquisition of lands outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations in the State of New Mexico, as proposed by the Senate.

On no. 14: Appropriates \$260,000 for the preservation of timber on Indian reservations instead of \$255,000, as proposed by the House, and \$280,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On no. 15: Eliminates the provision inserted by the Senate making \$12,500 of funds for emergency conservation work on Indian reservations available for defraying the expenses of the Quetico-Superior committee.

On nos. 16, 17, 19, and 21: Eliminates the provisions, inserted by the Senate, providing for the establishment and prosecution of tribal enterprises, including a consequent reduction of \$75,000.

On no. 18: Corrects a total.

On no. 20: Appropriates \$6,000 for industrial assistance of the Spokane Indians, Washington, as proposed by the Senate.

On no. 22: Makes \$65,000 available of the appropriation for personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, in connection with the administration of the revolving loan fund under the Indian Reorganization Act, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$50,000, as proposed by the House.

On no. 23: Makes \$18,000 available for personal services in the District of Columbia in connection with the development of Indian arts and crafts, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$15,000, as proposed by the House.

On no. 25: Appropriates \$5,379,820, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,304,820, as proposed by the House, for the education of Indian children.

On nos. 26 and 27: Appropriates \$345,000 for the lease, purchase, and repair of buildings at Indian schools, as proposed by the House, instead of \$420,000, which might also be used for construction purposes, as proposed by the Senate.

On no. 28: Makes \$1,000 for the operation and maintenance of the Pierre, S. Dak., nonreservation boarding school available for the purchase of lands adjacent to the school, as proposed by the Senate.

On nos. 29, 30, and 32, relating to the education of natives in Alaska: Appropriates \$25,000 for relief of destitution, corrects the total of the appropriation and provides that a report shall be made to Congress covering expenditures for the relief of destitution, all as proposed by the Senate.

On no. 34: Appropriates \$20,000 for clinical surveys and general medical research in connection with tuberculosis, trachoma, and venereal and other disease conditions among Indians, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of \$15,000, as proposed by the House.

On no. 36: Appropriates \$2,375,000, of which \$10,000 shall be immediately available, for general support of Indians, in lieu of an appropriation of \$2,360,000, as proposed by the House, and

\$2,385,000, or which \$25,000 would have been made immediately available, as proposed by the Senate.

On no. 37: Appropriates \$800 for the Rocky Boy Indians of Montana for general support and administration, as proposed by the Senate.

On no. 38: Appropriates \$25,000 for the Cherokee Indians of North Carolina for general support and administration, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$18,000, as proposed by the House.

On no. 40: Eliminates \$1,200 for fees and expenses of attorneys for the Yankton Indians of South Dakota, proposed by the Senate.

On nos. 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45, relating to the support of Indians in the State of Washington: Appropriates \$20,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$12,500, as proposed by the House, for the Taholah Indians; appropriates \$26,000 for the Neah Bay Indians, of which \$3,500 shall be available for development of a cemetery site, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$22,500, as proposed by the House; appropriates \$500 for the Hoh Indians, as proposed by the Senate, and corrects the total of the items in the paragraph.

On nos. 47, 48, and 49, relating to expenses of tribal officers, Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma: Eliminates the Creek Indians from the purposes provided in the paragraph with the exception of \$600 for the salary of the chief of the Creek Nation, as proposed by the Senate, and provides a salary of \$3,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the mining trustee for the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, instead of \$4,000, as proposed by the House.

On no. 51: Appropriates \$50,000 for traveling and other expenses of tribal councils, as proposed by the House, in lieu of \$75,000, as proposed by the Senate.

#### BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

On no. 55: Limits the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, in connection with the Boulder Canyon project, to not to exceed \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate.

#### GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

On no. 57: Appropriates \$140,000 for personal services in the office of the Director, instead of \$128,060, as proposed by the House, and \$150,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On nos. 58, 59, and 60, relating to topographic surveys: Appropriates \$650,000, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of \$440,000, as proposed by the House, of which \$250,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$175,000, as proposed by the House, and eliminates the proviso inserted by the Senate requiring the Secretary of the Interior to submit to Congress at the next session a program for expediting topographic mapping and the cost of same.

On nos. 61, 62, and 63, relating to geologic surveys: Appropriates \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of \$488,000, as proposed by the House, of which \$315,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of \$300,000, as proposed by the House, and provides that such portion of \$10,000 as may be necessary shall be available for a survey of the occurrence and uses of granite in the Northeastern States, as proposed by the Senate, instead of requiring that not less than \$10,000 be expended for such purpose, as proposed by the House.

On nos. 64 and 65, relating to mineral resources of Alaska: Appropriates \$60,000, as proposed by the House, in lieu of \$70,000, as proposed by the Senate, and provides that \$34,000 of this sum shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20,000, as proposed by the House.

On nos. 66 and 67, relating to gaging streams: Appropriates \$791,317, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$660,000, as proposed by the House, and provides that \$589,317 shall be available only for cooperative work with States or municipalities, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of \$458,000, as proposed by the House.

On no. 68: Makes an addition to a statute reference by inserting the words "as amended", as proposed by the Senate.

On nos. 69, 70, and 71, relating to mineral leasing: Appropriates \$315,000, of which \$30,000 shall be immediately available, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of \$225,000, as proposed by the House, and makes \$75,000 available for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of \$56,000, as proposed by the House, and \$120,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On no. 72: Corrects a total.

#### BUREAU OF MINES

On no. 73: Appropriates \$609,365, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of \$583,215, as proposed by the House, for operating mine-rescue cars and stations and investigation of mine accidents.

On no. 74: Appropriates \$185,400, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of \$165,400, as proposed by the House, for testing fuel.

On no. 75: Appropriates \$265,866, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$250,366, as proposed by the House, for oil and gas investigations.

On nos. 76 and 77, relating to economics of mineral industries: Appropriates \$339,990, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$300,490, as proposed by the House, and makes \$255,700 available for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$220,000, as proposed by the House.

On no. 78: Eliminates proviso permitting the sale of helium by the Bureau of Mines to the medical profession, as proposed by the Senate.

On no. 79: Eliminates the item appropriating \$20,000 for repair of a gas well on the helium property of the Bureau of Mines near Amarillo, Tex., inserted by the Senate.

On no. 80: Corrects a total.



## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

On nos. 81 and 82, relating to the Shenandoah National Park, Va.: Corrects the title and eliminates proviso prohibiting the use of funds made available in the paragraph for administration, protection, and maintenance in advance of title to the minimum acreage required in the basic act establishing the park having been conveyed to and accepted by the Federal Government, as proposed by the Senate.

On no. 84: Provides that appropriations for the Department of the Interior shall be available for the purchase, maintenance, and operation of quarter-ton or half-ton trucks, and that such purchase need not be charged to the limitation in the various appropriation items for the purchase, etc., of passenger-carrying vehicles, as proposed by the Senate.

## OFFICE OF EDUCATION

On no. 85: Appropriates \$262,980, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$261,180, as proposed by the House, for personal services in the office of the Commissioner of Education.

On no. 86: Appropriates \$20,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$17,700, as proposed by the House, for general expenses.

## PUERTO RICAN HURRICANE RELIEF

On no. 88: Makes available \$25,000 from unobligated balances of appropriations for continuation of the work of collecting moneys due the United States, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of \$17,740, as proposed by the House.

## ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

On no. 89: Eliminates reference to the disbursing agent, as proposed by the Senate.

On nos. 90 and 91: Provides \$250,000 for the construction and equipment of one continuous-treatment building, as proposed by the House, instead of two such buildings, at a total cost of \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

## AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The committee of conference report in disagreement the following amendments of the Senate:

On no. 1: Relating to payment for the cost of transporting personal effects of employees of the Division of Grazing Control.

On no. 7: Relating to the use of \$750,000 of moneys appropriated to carry out the provisions of title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act for the purpose of surveying public lands.

On no. 24: Relating to the construction, repair, and rehabilitation of irrigation systems on Indian reservations.

On no. 31: Providing that funds appropriated for the education of natives in Alaska shall remain available until June 30, 1938.

On no. 32: Requiring that a report shall be made to Congress regarding expenditures in Alaska for relief of destitution.

On no. 33: Reappropriation of an unexpended balance in connection with construction of the Sioux Sanatorium, South Dakota.

On no. 35: Providing that funds appropriated for medical relief in Alaska shall be available until June 30, 1938.

On nos. 39 and 46: Relating to an appropriation for traveling expenses of tribal council of Klamath Indians and to the establishment of a revolving fund to cover burial of said Indians. The total of the item General support, tribal funds, is also involved.

On no. 50: Relating to the acquisition of Tuskahoma Council House, in Pushmataha County, Okla.

On no. 52: Relating to a per-capita payment to enrolled members of the Menominee Tribe, Wisconsin.

On nos. 53 and 54: Relating to the authorization and appropriations for various reclamation projects.

On no. 56: Exempting from the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923 employees engaged in connection with the all-American Canal.

On no. 83: Relating to the Appomattox Courthouse National Historical Monument, Va.

On no. 87: Relating to an appropriation for a survey of school library service by the office of education.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,  
B. M. JACOBSEN,  
JED JOHNSON,  
W. P. LAMBERTSON,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I hope the report of the committee of conference may be adopted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I understand the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] desires to be heard on the conference report.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. As I understand it, we shall have ample time on these amendments as they come up. I am perfectly willing, of course, to yield the gentleman all the time he wants.

Mr. TABER. I understood the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] desired time on the conference report.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have some explanation of the conference report, to see how much it has been increased and to get a general idea of it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to have a few minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. How much time do you gentlemen suggest?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I would suggest an hour on the conference report, 2 hours on amendments nos. 53 and 54, and probably an hour on the rest of the amendments in disagreement; in all, a maximum of 4 hours.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Why not adopt the conference report first and then take up the amendments in disagreement? I am perfectly willing for the gentleman to have all the time he wants.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I would like to have a little time on the conference report itself.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Colorado yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. May I suggest to the gentleman from Kansas that the amendments in disagreement will have to be voted on as they involve very, very complicated questions. When we are approaching the question of fixing the policy of Congress for future years I think we ought to have plenty of time. I would suggest, therefore, that we devote the day to the consideration of the conference report and the Senate amendments.

Mr. TABER. That is all right, Mr. Speaker, if we can do it. I think we ought first to dispose of the conference report. It will not take a great while, so far as I can see. Speaking for myself, I do not want more than 2 or 3 minutes, but I think we ought to have a few minutes on the conference report. Then we can proceed to amendment no. 24 and take it up by itself. Each one of the important amendments should be given consideration as it is reached.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from New York that I am perfectly willing, if necessary, to take all day, but I do not see the necessity for extended debate on the conference report. I can state the comparative figures for last year and this year, what the Senate did and what the House did, in 3 minutes.

Mr. TABER. I think that should be done. Then I would like 2 or 3 minutes on the conference report, and I think the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] desires a few minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman should first explain the report. Let us know what is in it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the first item I think the House will be concerned about is that the regular and supplemental estimates were \$147,652,441.75, and the amount that is being recommended by the conferees to the House is \$143,503,957.05.

Mr. Speaker, this bill as it appears before us today is \$4,148,000 under the Budget, and I may say that I am dealing in round figures only. The reason the bill carries more this year than it did last year is because last year we had no construction whatever in the bill. Last year the bill carried \$77,000,000. This year it carries \$143,500,000. This increase is represented by construction, which was not in the bill last year.

The 1937 bill, as it passed the Senate, carried \$143,978,000. The bill as it passed the House carried \$81,221,000. In other words, the net amount that was added to the House bill by the Senate is \$62,757,000—as I say, speaking in round numbers.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MAY. In what way are the additions made by the Senate calculated to commit us to a policy with respect to general improvements, if it does effect any policy, and what



might be the ultimate expenditure on them over the years to come?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. There are about 16 amendments in disagreement, and we will take them up seriatim and discuss them. As we reach them we shall be able to answer all these questions.

I may say that the House recessions in conference amounted to \$62,287,267, and the Senate recessions amounted to \$469,800.

That is the principal part of the sum total.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. How much is the increase over the House bill that the conferees have agreed to? What is the amount of the increase?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I may say that the Senate bill is \$3,973,000 under the Budget. The House bill was \$1,721,000 under the Budget.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman misunderstood the question. I intended to ask the gentleman how much is carried in the Senate bill over the House bill that has been agreed to? This does not include the amendments in disagreement.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The amount involved in the conference report?

Mr. SNELL. Yes; the amount involved in the conference report proper.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, I think I can answer the question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand it is the contention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] and the gentleman from Massachusetts that the increase involved in the conference report is approximately \$800,000.

Mr. TABER. I think I can clear this up if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. As I understand it, the bill as passed by the House covered \$81,221,330.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. TABER. This included something like \$26,350,000, as shown on page 83 of the Budget estimate. The increases with reference to those items, as I understand it, amounted to \$1,200,000, as put on by the Senate. The conference report, the vote on which is now pending, increases those items \$800,000.

Mr. SNELL. What are the items included in that increase of \$800,000?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not have those items right at hand, but they will be brought out and discussed later in debate.

Mr. AYERS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. AYERS. The adoption of the gentleman's motion to agree to the conference report does not in any way affect the consideration by the Members of the House of the matters in disagreement?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, no.

Mr. AYERS. Which includes amendments 1, 7, 24, and so forth?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No. We will have to discuss each one of those amendments in disagreement.

Mr. AYERS. The adoption of the gentleman's motion does not affect the amendments in disagreement?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] 10 minutes.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is an important day. The House bill recommended eighty-one million to the Interior Department for the next fiscal year. The Senate amended it by putting in sixty-three million more—over 70 percent increase. Amendments 24, 53, and 54 deal with the big increases in the form of loans for the extension of irrigation projects in the Mountain States.

The crux of this situation is contained in amendment 53, where we are asked to authorize seven gigantic irrigation projects in seven separate States. It has been the policy of this subcommittee, in the 3 years I have been a member of it, to carefully refrain from recommending appropriations for any new irrigation projects. The reason we gave was that the Government was extending itself on a policy of curtailment of surpluses in agricultural products. Now suddenly, out of an almost clear sky, we are asked to authorize these seven great projects and appropriate many millions immediately for their extension. This ought to be a serious day. We are asking those of you who agree with us to lay aside party prejudices and have the courage to vote your honest convictions. It will take from \$600,000,000 to \$1,500,000,000 to complete the projects asked for in these amendments. Yes; the Budget has O. K.'d six of these seven projects in amendment 53, and to some of you that may seem to dignify and to justify it. This was all done suddenly by the Director of the Budget just this last January. To me it is the most gigantic and indefensible pork barrel which has come upon this Congress in some time; seven States approaching us at the same time on the reversal of a policy. The Washington State project did not need authorization but was put into this fifty-third amendment to help the pork barrel. One of the most asinine features of these big projects is that a great deal of money has been spent by the P. W. A. and the W. P. A. under allotments by the President where we are now and finally asked for authorization. This gets thoroughly under my hide. There ought to be a righteous reaction with everyone here. Here is required legislative authority for the expenditure of money before these projects can be completed, yet money has been spent by the Executive, and now at last the policy of whether these projects should have ever been started are asked, necessarily, from the Congress. Another Florida canal. Is it not a mess? And this is my Government and yours. We of the Mississippi Valley, in particular, who in the old days favored the McNary-Haugen bill, and who in this administration went along with the Chief Executive on the theory that there was an overproduction and that we had to curtail if we are to have American prices for our agricultural products consumed in America. Generally we voted for the A. A. A., and only this winter for its substitute on soil conservation, taking land out of production; and now, amazing as it may seem, still in this second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, we are asked to help all the Pacific States to make two blades of grass grow where only one grew before, in spite of all the fancied arguments which will be offered here today about this extra production not being in competition with anything else; do not you believe it. Whenever they raise more, it is just that much more. It may not come back in the direct manner, but it comes back; food products may be in cereals or on hoof. The extension of reclamation and curtailment under soil erosion are diametrically opposed. This is too expensive. The Government could put its money to better use in the extension of road construction than to loan up to \$200 and more per acre for agricultural production. If the Government will loan this money, these great projects will be accomplished, people will be attracted to these places, and that is its purpose, to build up these States in population beyond their natural and normal quotas, and naturally at the expense of other agricultural lands in the country.

Furthermore, it is proposed here to loan this money for a term of 40 years without interest. I wonder if William Green will think this is not inflation. A great deal was said here the other day about the inequality in the Frazier-Lemke bill, that it was so unfair to loan money to farmers up to 80 percent of the assessed value of the land at 1½ percent on about an equal number of years. But here you propose to loan it without any interest at all—up to \$200 per acre. Certainly, these values are not even as secure as other lands, for the water may run out or it may sink away.

All in all, colleagues, I think we should oppose these three reclamation amendments which the Senate has added to this bill. We should swat this pork barrel, we should accept the



policy of curtailment until it is abandoned at least, and, above all, we should resent the practice of inaugurating, under the disguise of relief, far-reaching projects where first there should have been an authorization by Congress. I do not wish the Western States any bad luck, but this is an unfair advantage to a section in agriculture, and the whole thing is a conglomeration and a mess, and we should defeat these amendments and postpone it until we take time for a sober second thought.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to approval of the conference report. In this connection I want to emphasize the extent to which the total appropriation carried by this bill has increased in recent years.

For the fiscal year 1934 the bill carried \$43,000,000 or thereabouts. For the next fiscal year the figure rose to \$47,000,000. For the present year, with deficiency items included, it went to \$77,000,000. When the bill for the next fiscal year passed the House this year it carried a total of about \$81,000,000. The House will recall that a motion to recommit, reducing this figure to last year's figure, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], was defeated in the House.

The bill went to the Senate. It returns to us today carrying a total of over \$143,000,000, more than \$62,000,000 more than was carried by the bill when it passed the House and over \$100,000,000 more than the bill carried 3 years ago. Furthermore, this does not include about \$780,000 representing reappropriation of unexpended balances, assuming that the House approves of amendments 7 and 33 when we reach them in the course of this discussion.

Of course, a large amount of the increase is in dispute. Reference has already been made to the \$3,700,000 item carried in amendment no. 24 for Indian irrigation projects. Reference has also been made to amendments 53 and 54, providing for a gigantic reclamation program calling for \$57,000,000 or thereabouts now and running into the hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars ultimately.

There are 16 items in dispute which, of course, must be voted on separately by the House, but over and above this is the conference report itself. The first vote in the House will be taken on the conference report. It is the report which is before the House at this time. The report reflects an increase of \$837,127 over and above what was approved by the House a month or two ago. I regret that illness prevented me from attending the conference on this bill. I did not sign the conference report. I cannot support the conference report this morning. Reading the additions which have been made in the light of the evidence offered in the Senate hearings and in the supplemental House hearings, it seems to me that concessions have been made to the Senate conferees all along the line—concessions which are not warranted by the facts.

The total, as I say, amounts to \$837,127. Time does not permit going into details. I can only say that in my judgment unjustifiable increases have been made in conference amounting to several hundred thousand dollars. I am therefore compelled, Mr. Speaker, to vote against the conference report.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon 3 minutes.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to amendment no. 2, on page 2 of the conference report. Under the Taylor grazing bill, provision was made to pay members of the advisory board a per diem of \$5 and 5 cents a mile travel when in actual attendance or at work.

The Senate amendment, according to the conference report, proposes to pay those members of that advisory board a straight salary of \$5 a day throughout the year.

Mr. GREEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. GREEVER. Does not the Senate amendment provide that they shall only receive \$5 a day when actually employed? That is what the conference report reads.

Mr. MOTT. I do not interpret it that way. The amendment provides that they shall receive \$5 a day, according to the conference report. The printed bill with the Senate amendments has not yet been made available to Members. Perhaps the report does not correctly state the amendment.

Mrs. GREENWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the lady from Arizona.

Mrs. GREENWAY. Does not the gentleman think that it is a good thing that local citizens are now included and allowed a voice in their own affairs with an expense account to make it practical and just?

Mr. MOTT. That provision I think is proper, but that was not the point of my objection. I interpret the statement in the conference report as meaning that the Senate amendment permits payment of a regular salary of \$5. If the amendment does not provide that, I have no objection to it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM].

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment provides a uniform remuneration of \$5 per diem while actually employed as a district board. That will probably be only a comparatively few days out of every year.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It expressly says it is only while they are on duty. There are only 482 in the whole United States to regulate grazing on the public domain of 80,000,000 acres.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, just for fear some confusion exists in the minds of some of my colleagues relative to this conference report, let me state there can be no possible objection to the adoption of this conference report as agreed to by the conferees and presented to the House. The House conferees yielded about seven or eight hundred thousand dollars of increases of the Senate in the bill as it passed the House. That is close enough. You cannot expect them not to yield anything. So the conference report ought to be adopted. The amendments which follow the adoption of the conference report will be before the House, and the House ought to further insist on some of them, and you will hear the reasons for that when we come to it, but this report should be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me repeat what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] just said. We reach all these things when we come to them. Why should we thrash it out in advance?

Mr. RICH. I would like to say for about a week I have been trying to find out when this was coming on the floor. The majority leader said we would have plenty of time to discuss it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Very well. I yield the gentleman 5 minutes right now.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt but that the gentleman from Texas and these other conferees have been trying to keep this appropriation down to the limit, but I want to call attention to the fact that in the appropriation bill they have \$26,350,000 additional over what it was last year for public works. The amount of the Interior Department appropriation bill last year was over \$77,000,000. When it left the House this year it was over \$81,000,000, but if we add the things which the Senate wants to put in in these 16 items which are in dispute, they are asking for \$64,710,000, and that includes \$2,500,000 for administration expenses. When you finally complete all these projects which they want you to approve in item 54 alone, you will have over a billion dollars of expenses that will be saddled onto the taxpayers of the country in the future. You must have somebody to operate these projects and add to our



national burden. It will be an additional expense to the children who are coming on in this country, and I say to you Members of Congress now that you are simply stealing the savings of future generations. This Congress in the past 2 years has been doing things which it never should do. In the first place, you gave the President of the United States \$4,880,000,000. You gave up your rights. You have all stood up here in the House this year and condemned that very thing. Then you gave the President \$1,500,000,000 more in the deficiency bill to do some more. They are not satisfied with that wrong way of doing things. They come in here and ask for these 16 projects to be approved, and before you get through with them you will have to spend over a billion dollars more.

Look at the statement of the Federal Treasury at the present time—thirty-three billions in debt and going in the red at the rate of six hundred thousand per hour. It is nice for us to come here and say nice things about ourselves and pat each other on the back and say, "Oh, we are a bunch of good fellows." I would like to do it if I could, but I think we are a bunch of boobs when we take everything that the Senate sends over here for us to approve and agree to this legislation, and then mortgage the children of the future for these follies. We do not have any common sense. Where are these projects? They are out in the Northwest. Look at the members on this conference committee from the Senate. They are mostly from the Northwest, and they want these projects for their own States at the expense of our taxpayers. They will bring in over 3,000,000 acres of agricultural ground. What for? To raise more produce, when you are trying to get the farmers of this country to stop producing, when you are buying submarginal lands to put them out of cultivation. We just do not use good judgment. We just do not use common sense in doing these things. Plug up one hole and make another. Here we are asked to bring in 3,000,000 acres of irrigated ground when we should be protecting the farmers, who are now requested to curtail production because they have no markets for their farm products.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. THURSTON. A vote against the conference report will be a vote against these projects which will cost about a billion and a half dollars.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were ayes 87 and noes 22.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1: Page 4, line 22, "payments for the cost of packing, crating, and transportation (including drayage) of personal effects of employees upon permanent change of station, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 7: Page 14, line 16, after the word "deposit", insert: "Provided further, That of the unexpended balance of moneys appropriated to carry out the provisions of title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933, such amount, not exceeding \$750,000, as the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works may deem necessary is hereby made available for surveys and resurveys of public lands during the fiscal years 1936 and 1937, to be expended under the supervision of the Commissioner of the General Land Office in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 24: Page 41, after line 6, insert: "For the construction, repair, and rehabilitation of irrigation systems on Indian reservations; for the purchase or rental of equipment, tools, and appliances; for the acquisition of rights-of-way, and payment of damages in connection with such irrigation systems; for the development of domestic and stock water and water for subsistence gardens; for the purchase of water rights, ditches, and lands needed for such projects; and for drainage and protection of irrigable lands from damage by floods or loss of water rights, as follows:

"Arizona: Colorado River, as authorized by section 2 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, approved August 30, 1935, \$1,000,000; Havasupai, \$5,000; Hopi, \$50,000; Navajo, \$70,000; Ak Chin, \$3,000; Navajo and Hopi (domestic and stock water), \$45,000; Chiu Chui, \$5,000; Papago (domestic and stock water), \$26,400; San Xavier, \$30,000; Salt River, \$55,000; San Carlos, \$25,000; Fort Apache, \$10,000;

"Colorado: Consolidated Ute, \$65,000, reimbursable; Pine River, \$1,000,000, reimbursable;

"Montana: Crow, \$100,000, reimbursable; Fort Belknap, \$12,000; Fort Peck, \$125,000, reimbursable.

"Nevada: Fort McDermitt, \$2,000; Moapa, \$5,000; Summit Lake, \$5,000; Walker River, \$5,000; miscellaneous (garden tracts), \$5,000.

"New Mexico: Navajo, \$69,500; Pueblo, \$240,100; Jicarilla, \$13,000; Navajo and Pueblo (domestic and stock water), \$60,000.

"North Dakota: Miscellaneous (domestic and stock water and garden tracts), \$15,000.

"Oklahoma: Miscellaneous (garden tracts), \$16,000.

"Oregon: Warm Springs, \$10,000; miscellaneous (garden tracts), \$5,000.

"South Dakota: Miscellaneous (domestic and stock water), \$10,000.

"Utah: Uncompahgre, \$10,000; Oljeto and Montezuma Creeks, \$3,500; miscellaneous (garden tracts), \$5,000.

"Washington: Lummi, \$20,000; Makah (dikes and flood gates), \$5,000; Wapato, \$100,000, reimbursable; Klickitat, \$50,000; miscellaneous (domestic and stock water and garden tracts), \$20,000.

"Wisconsin: Miscellaneous (garden tracts), \$5,000.

"Wyoming: Wind River, \$105,000, reimbursable.

"For miscellaneous small irrigation developments, \$200,000.

"For administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, \$100,000.

"In all, \$3,710,500, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That the foregoing amounts may be used interchangeably, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, but not more than 10 percent of any specific amount shall be transferred to any other amount, and no appropriation shall be increased by more than 15 percent: *Provided further*, That when necessary the foregoing amounts may be used for subjugating lands for which irrigation facilities are being developed."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 24, with an amendment, as follows:

"In line 10, the first line of the second paragraph of said amendment, after the word 'by' insert the following: 'and in accordance with.'"

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 24.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the motion to recede and concur is a preferential motion. I ask a division of the motion to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is entitled to a division of the motion. The question is, Will the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this is an item involving \$3,710,500 for the continuation and the beginning of certain reclamation projects, all of which are supposed to cost \$70,000,000. Something like \$10,000,000 has been spent on some of them, or allocated to some of them, out of relief funds. As I understand it—I am not sure, but I give you the best information I can get—the acreage increase is 444,000. This would make the cost \$160 per acre. Just



think of the enormity and ridiculousness of our appropriating \$70,000,000 more money to bring land under cultivation at a time when we are appropriating and spending millions of dollars to take land out of cultivation. Is it not time to stop?

You will be told that this is to be taken out of Indian funds, or supposed to be reimbursable. Have we any less responsibility to use common sense in making our appropriations here in the House because it is perhaps out of Indian funds or supposed to be reimbursable? But what does "reimbursable" mean? I asked the Chief of the Reclamation Service. It seems to mean that you let them have the money without interest, and it is supposed to be repaid in 40 or 50 years. It means an outright gift from the Treasury of the United States of 50 percent of the whole amount.

I hope the Members of the House of Representatives today will stand up and be counted on this first part of a tremendous irrigation program that is going to be presented to you and which will cost the Treasury of the United States in all before we get through with it, if once we start it, \$1,500,000,000; and I will give you the total when we reach item no. 53.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that when this money is invested and these communities established, and new places built, that the taxes coming to the Government will more than repay the Government for any interest they might lose on the money?

Mr. TABER. No; that is not the fact. The fact is that the Government continues to spend money on these projects; and the further we get into it the longer the depression will last.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will vote down the motion to recede in this matter and thus make a start, and make it on this particular item.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a matter of fact that the gentleman's State depends on the development of new communities and the bringing in of new land?

Mr. TABER. It is a fact that the gentleman's own communities are hurt by every such development at times when there is no market for the agricultural products. It is a fact that the gentleman is hurting himself and cutting his own throat by the development of these irrigation projects.

Mr. WHITE. I do not believe the gentleman realizes the facts, or he would not make such a statement.

Mr. TABER. I am familiar with the facts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words for the integrity of our Budget system, for the integrity of our appropriation system, and for the reputation of Congress in conducting the public affairs in a businesslike manner.

The pending amendment carries a number of projects too numerous to count. I think there are about 42; not a single one of them was recommended by the Budget.

Not a single one was ever submitted to the Budget by the Department for consideration. Can we stand for that?

I am not speaking of the merits or demerits of any of these projects. No Member upon this floor can discuss the merits or demerits of the projects intelligently, because the hearings are not complete enough to do that. It is merely the case of one man getting up and stating a few conclusions of his own about the different projects. Remember, not a single one was ever submitted by the Department to the Budget for consideration. None of these projects were included in the bill as it passed the House. The bill went to the Senate, and they summoned the Secretary of the Interior before them and asked him: "Is there not something we can do for these people out there?" Mr. Speaker, I repeat, these were never considered by the Budget, nor even submitted to the Budget

by the Secretary of the Interior. An appropriation is included in here of \$3,710,500. Does this cover just one project? Is that all we are obligated to give them? If so, for God's sake, let us give it to them and get through with this matter. But that is not all. They take the \$3,710,500 and scatter it over about 42 projects, a little here and a little there. The work is commenced in some instances. These projects will involve obligations of from \$26,900,000 to \$50,000,000 in order to complete them.

Mr. Speaker, is that business? What in the name of common sense have we a Budget for?

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Can the gentleman tell from the hearings, or has he any information otherwise, as to the probable cost of all of these projects?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I made the statement that these projects will involve future obligations of from \$26,900,000 to \$50,000,000. This innocent little \$3,710,500, which has been included by the Senate committee, has been scattered around over 42 projects and in order to complete them it will take from \$26,900,000 to \$50,000,000. Even the advocate of this proposition in the Senate admitted it would take \$32,000,000 to complete them.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to present these facts to the membership. This \$3,710,500 covers Indian projects. I want to show the membership just where we are going. Formerly, when we made improvements for the Indians—and this includes irrigation projects—they were required to pay the actual cost of construction. Finally they failed to pay the principal, and then we passed a law which provided that wherever it was evident or could be established or proved that the Indians could not pay—and I may say white people were mixed up with them and got the benefit of these improvements—proof of that fact could be filed with the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior, and if Congress did not reject the recommendation of the Secretary within 60 days the entire amount was canceled and, in effect, donated to the Indians. Under this particular law we have already donated over \$12,000,000, a large part of which has gone into the construction of these various irrigation projects.

Mr. Speaker, these things will go on and on. The particular projects involved in this item were not considered by the Budget and were not thought of by the Department until summoned before the Senate committee.

Let us have these things done in an orderly manner. Let us have them submitted to the Budget and then sent over here to the Congress. Let them be investigated by both branches of the Congress and not by just one branch alone.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Why were not these particular projects brought into the gentleman's committee so that the proposals could be considered?

Mr. BUCHANAN. They were not even submitted to the Budget. They did not come to my committee, and they did not go to the Budget.

Mr. RICH. I want to say that I admire the gentleman in his stand, and I hope the Members of the House will back him up.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not know about that, but I feel it is my duty to state the facts to the membership. The interest and integrity of the Congress, as well as the application of business principles in connection with the administration of the Government, demand that we refuse to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM].

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be some confusion as to what question the membership is preparing to vote. This question applies to amendment 24, page 41 of the bill, and relates solely to the construction and repair of irrigation systems on Indian reservations. It has nothing



whatever to do with the main program of reclamation and irrigation as included in amendments 53 and 54.

Mr. Speaker, the question involved here is one of moral responsibility to the Indian race. These Indians have been largely settled in the arid lands of the West. They are a poor people, in many cases a forgotten people. They have to eat, they have to live, and the proposal in this amendment properly provides a place for the Indians of the United States, who are wards of the Government, where they can make a living and feed themselves. It is the only issue involved.

Mr. Speaker, I have spent most of my life in the far West, and I know the desperate poverty and the destitution which exist among many Indians. It is the policy of this Government and the policy of the present administration to make the Indian self-supporting.

First let us take up a typical project, the Colorado River project in Arizona.

The Colorado River project, Arizona, proposed by the Indian Irrigation Service, involves the construction of a diversion dam in the Colorado River and the necessary canal system to irrigate a total of approximately 100,000 acres of Indian land. This is undoubtedly the most economical, undeveloped irrigation project remaining in the United States today. The complete irrigation system, including a diversion dam, can be constructed for approximately \$65 per acre, and the annual operation and maintenance charge after the full area is developed will probably not exceed \$1.50 per acre. The land is all in Government ownership and, with the exception of about 7,000 acres now being irrigated from a pumping plant, is unallotted and available for the establishment of any Indians residing within the Colorado River watershed. This would include the Navajo, Walapai, Papago, Yuma, and other Indians. The project as designed is ideal from the standpoint of development in that after the diversion dam is constructed, the project can be developed at any speed desired; that is, the development can be prosecuted on the basis of 10,000 acres per year for 10 years, 5,000 acres per year for 20 years, and so forth.

The Indian Office plan is not only to build an irrigation system for supplying water to the land but to actually clear, level, and subjugate the area in order that any Indians assigned land under the project might be able to raise a crop immediately. This scheme will assure the success of the Indians to whom this land is assigned and will materially assist the Indian Bureau in working out the economic independence of a large group of Indians. In addition to the justification for this project from the economic side, it is also very necessary to begin construction immediately in order to put this amount of water from the Colorado River to beneficial use within the United States. The asset of the Colorado River will be very much depreciated within a few years unless steps are immediately taken to use the water beneficially and not permit it to flow into Mexico.

Next let us consider the Pine River Storage Dam in Colorado.

The proposed Pine River Storage Dam is located on Pine River, in the southeastern part of Colorado, about 18 miles above the town of Bayfield. As planned by the Indian Irrigation Service, it will be a combined flood-control and irrigation structure and will cost approximately \$3,000,000, \$1,000,000 of which is proposed to be expended this year and \$1,000,000 each during the fiscal years 1938 and 1939. Preliminary designs were completed several years ago, and the final design is now being prepared under an allotment of \$50,000 made available by the Public Works Administration. The final design will be completed within a few months.

The reservoir created by this dam will have a capacity of 100,000 acre-feet and will reduce the flood hazard on this stream, which has caused property damage from \$25,000 to \$200,000 per year, as well as make available approximately 54,000 acre-feet of stored water per year for use on about 52,000 acres, 35,000 acres of which are white-owned lands and 17,000 acres Indian-owned lands. It is proposed to charge one-half of the cost of this dam to flood control, and one-half will be reimbursed by the lands benefited.

By Federal court decree of October 25, 1930, a priority as of July 25, 1868, was granted to the Indian lands for 213 second-feet diversion from Pine River for use on approximately 17,000 acres. During the summer months, when water is needed most for irrigation purposes, the normal flow of Pine River is sometimes as little as 85 second-feet. This amount is wholly inadequate for the proper irrigation of the Indian lands alone and means simply that without storage the 35,000 acres of white-owned lands along the stream will have to be abandoned. Efforts have been made by both the Indian Office and the Representative from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] to secure funds for the construction of this dam for a great number of years. The conditions as to water shortage have been accentuated during the past few years on account of erosion and more rapid run-off, so that the problem of protecting the homes and the property of both the Indians and whites is now very serious.

The mean annual discharge of Pine River is approximately 290,000 acre-feet, and a study of the hydrography indicates that without this proposed storage the Indian lands alone would have an average annual shortage of about 9,400 acre-feet and that the 35,000 acres of white-owned lands would have an average annual shortage of about 45,000 acre-feet. The construction of this dam as proposed will eliminate these shortages and protect the investment of the farmers, as well as prevent further erosion and flood damage downstream. The repayment of 50 percent of the cost of the structure will be made by the lands benefited. The amount chargeable to the white-owned lands will be repaid without interest, and a water users' association has already been formed, with which a repayment contract will be negotiated before construction is started. The costs chargeable to these white-owned lands will not be excessive, being only approximately \$30 per acre. Payments will be spread over a period of 40 years, making the annual charge something less than \$1 per acre.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. What explanation has the gentleman for the fact that these projects were not submitted to the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I shall refer to that a little later on.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Let me finish my statement and then I shall yield. Probably the gentleman's question will be answered in my statement.

Senator HAYDEN, chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations in charge of this appropriation bill, on February 5 wrote to the Secretary of the Interior as follows:

I notice that the Interior Department appropriation bill for the next fiscal year, now before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, carries no Indian irrigation items except for maintenance. I should be glad to be advised as to the reason for this omission and also whether there are not some construction items which might be inserted in the bill by the Senate. If so, please let me have your proposals and also any suggestions as to changes in the bill, so that sufficient funds may be provided for necessary Indian irrigation projects without increasing the Budget estimates.

The answer to your question, I think, is found in the reply from the Secretary of the Interior to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the United States Senate which states that the estimate for the Indian Service for the fiscal year 1937 did not include new construction for the reason that they had expected to obtain the money from the P. W. A., and then it was found that these projects could not be undertaken at a figure of \$1,145 per man-year of employment and consequently could not qualify under the requirements laid down for the allotment of the \$4,800,000,000 appropriation. A full explanation is given in this letter of the Secretary.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield.

Mr. BIERMANN. Why is it that this proposition was not considered by the House Appropriations Committee?



Mr. SCRUGHAM. The conference committee considered it.

Mr. BIERMANN. That does not answer my question. The House Appropriations Committee never considered this item.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. It was not submitted because they expected to get the money from the relief funds, and they found at a comparatively late date that it would cost more than \$1,145 per man-year of employment, which is the limit set for the granting of such funds.

Mr. BIERMANN. I understood the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] to say that if this \$3,000,000 involved here were voted, it would ultimately result in a total expenditure of from \$26,000,000 to \$50,000,000.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I think the gentleman is confusing that statement with a statement relative to the general program. I think the statement about the \$26,000,000 or \$50,000,000 possibly refers to that program.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. According to the figures of Senator HAYDEN, which he gave out this morning, if we make the appropriation for these projects, it will involve a total appropriation of \$32,000,000 to finish them.

Let me ask my colleague a further question. Why cannot the Works Progress Administration make these expenditures out of the \$1,400,000,000 appropriation?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I cannot answer for the Works Progress Administration, but I understand that they have a limitation of \$1,145 per man-year of employment, and my authority is the letter of the Secretary of the Interior to Senator HAYDEN under date of February 10, 1936.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The Secretary of the Interior does not run the Works Progress Administration, and I know that Mr. Hopkins looks favorably on projects where a necessity exists to do useful work.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Let me complete my statement. The \$32,589,000, which the gentleman from Texas states that Senator HAYDEN gave out, does not refer to this item. I have the figures here in detail, and they referred to the construction of the United States reclamation projects, such as Gila, Ariz.; Salt River, Ariz.; Grand Valley; Boise; and so forth. It is a long list and did not refer to this Indian item.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The statement referred to the Indian items, and the figures of my own clerk show it is over \$26,000,000, while Senator HAYDEN said it will be \$32,000,000, and the probability is it will be \$50,000,000 before we finish it.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. That will be a question as to whether future Congresses wish to appropriate the money or not. The \$32,000,000 figure prepared and submitted by Senator HAYDEN refers to costs of authorized projects under the regular reclamation program.

Mr. REILLY. If the project is started, will we not have to keep it up?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The smaller projects are generally completed in a very few years, especially the Indian projects to which I am now referring.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman has referred to the Colorado project and the Arizona project, which call for \$2,000,000 at this time, and a total amounting to \$13,000,000. The gentleman has referred to the amendment as providing repairs to various projects. It is a fact, is it not, that no work has actually been started on either of the two major projects carried by this amendment?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I cannot give the exact status. These projects are for and upon Indian lands. If the Congress wishes to take proper care of the Indians, they should pass this legislation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. AYERS].

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Speaker, it humiliates me to disagree with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Com-

mittee [Mr. BUCHANAN]. But when he says that this bill is not a business measure I must take issue with him.

First, he contends that this matter was not submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, and, second, that it was not submitted to the Appropriations Committee. Answering these contentions, let me say that both of these objections lie at the door of the Indian Department. That Department never comes to the rescue of its wards in the way of constructive ideas, so I am not surprised that it did not appear in this meritorious case.

The efforts of the Indian Department, Mr. Speaker, is not to rehabilitate the Indians over the United States, but on the contrary, the Indian Department is trying to communize and retard the Indian in this country. From a humanitarian point of view and from a development and constructive point of view I firmly believe that the Indian Bureau is the biggest handicap we are confronted with in our public affairs today. During my 4 years in Congress this Bureau has been the surprise of my life. Its every effort is to take the Indian backward and not forward. The Bureau's only objective is to build up its own organization and its own personnel at the expense of the Indian whom it is supposed to help and advance.

In the last few months it has been trying to force codes upon the tribes throughout the country by having them adopt such codes, whereby they go back to old tribal customs and abandon all civil laws which have been enacted for them.

The Indians do not want to adopt these codes. They are anxious to advance and adopt the ways of modern civilization. But the Indian Bureau, by coercion of every kind, is trying to force its program upon them and retard every advancement which the Indian desires.

Knowing the attitude of the Indian Bureau, I am not surprised that it did not appear before the Bureau of the Budget or the Appropriations Committee to have these Indian irrigation projects rehabilitated. Now, Mr. Speaker, when I say "rehabilitated" I mean just exactly what I say, because that is the purpose of this bill. It is "for the construction, repair, and rehabilitation of irrigation systems on Indian reservations; for the purchase and rental of equipment, tools, and appliances; for the acquisition of rights-of-way and payment of damages in connection with such irrigation systems; for the development of domestic and stock water and water for subsistence gardens, and so forth", for Indian irrigation and reclamation systems now in existence in 12 of the western arid States where Indians have been confined and restricted upon and to reservations.

This appropriation is to rehabilitate and repair now-existing irrigation systems which the Indian Bureau, through its absolute negligence, has permitted to run down and deteriorate. The Bureau has done this purposely because it does not care to have the Indian advance. It would rather have a scheme and a system whereby the Indian would rent his lands for pasture purposes than to have him irrigate them and cultivate and harvest a crop from them which would make him self-sustaining. If the Indian should become self-sustaining—and he can do it by and through this system—then the Bureau would automatically go out of existence; but that is not the Bureau's intent. Its job is to continue in existence and to increase its own authority and its own personnel, 90 percent of which personnel is made up of people who never saw an Indian reservation and who never saw a State in which an Indian reservation is located.

Under the Indian Bureau's plan it would rather have the Indians rent their lands for livestock pasture for a mere pittance than to come before the Bureau of the Budget or before the Appropriations Committee and ask to have these irrigation systems rehabilitated so that the Indian would become self-sustaining.

Mr. Speaker, the Indian Bureau talks to you about Indian rights; but let me, as a person who is informed, tell you that the only thing the Indian Bureau thinks about is its rights, which are always detrimental to the Indian.

This bill is to rehabilitate the Indian and to reconstruct the Indian irrigation projects which the Bureau has let go to



waste, and we do not find a single solitary man or woman from the Indian Bureau appearing before the committee or appearing before the Bureau of the Budget to help put over this constructive legislation; on the contrary, by their silence and by their absence they give this proposed legislation their disapproval.

The appropriations in this bill for the Indian irrigation projects in my own State, if granted, would soon put the three respective reservations involved on a self-sustaining basis. In two of them the projects are adjacent to sugar-beet factories and the lands under the projects are susceptible to sugar-beet raising, and each of them would be raising sugar beets now if the Indian Bureau had done its duty and kept up these irrigation systems; but, as stated before, the Bureau would rather have the lands rented at a pittance than to have them irrigated and cultivated at a profit. In other words, the Bureau desires to keep the Indian in the fullest state of wardship rather than develop him into a state of self-sustaining citizenship.

The Indian Bureau, in order to perpetuate its existence, would rather keep the Indian on a dole and on an allotment and on a ration program than to permit him to become self-sustaining. And let me remind you that he is against the Bureau on this proposition. He is anxious to become self-sustaining.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman said the reason it was not submitted to the Budget was because they expected to get an allotment of money. The Senate hearings started on this thing on February 15. They had sufficient time to submit it to the Budget after the Senate started these hearings. They could have submitted it to the Budget then on the merits, and we could have had estimates on which to base our appropriation, but they did not do it. The Secretary of the Interior had the allotment of these funds. He ought to have known whether they were going to get the money or not.

Mr. AYERS. Evidently the Secretary did not have the request from the Indian Department. The Indian Department wants to keep these Indians on doles and on rations, instead of making them self-sustaining. I know this from experience. I am speaking as a Member who has six Indian reservations in his district, four of which have this class of irrigation project on them. The same condition exists in the other western States involved.

Mr. Speaker, this is a proper business deal for the Government, and when the Indian Department and the Interior Department failed to do their duty, then the Senate came forward in a business way and put this amendment on the bill. I say to you that this is strictly and unqualifiedly a business deal. I do not care if the Budget or the Appropriations Committee ever saw it or not—it is still good business. It will put these Indians in a place where they can be self-sustaining instead of requiring annual doles, rations, or help.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations knows, because I have appeared before that committee in connection with the subject, that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs waits until the last minute and then comes in and asks for an appropriation to tide the Indians over instead of going about it in the ordinary, honest, decent, businesslike way, in order to make the Indians self-sustaining. The Commissioner's requests are always requests to "tide over", or to communize, and not requests for constructive, progressive, and building policies.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYERS. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I know but very little about the Indians, but are there many Indians who know anything about practical farming?

Mr. AYERS. There are a great many; a large number, indeed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. AYERS] has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. AYERS. I do know this, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Tennessee, that the younger generation of Indians do know about practical farming, and they do desire to become practical farmers and livestock raisers. The Government is sending them from my State to agricultural colleges in South Dakota, in California, and in Oregon, teaching them practical farming. They come back to the reservations and they want to take up farming and livestock raising. I can give you one instance of an Indian boy who graduated from an agricultural college and he wanted to go out and help repair irrigation ditches and build up ranch and farm lands. He applied for the job, but the Government man in charge told him to put on his blanket and go back to his tepee. In the meantime, a man from the East, who had never seen an irrigation ditch or a ranch, was given the job. Of course, that was not surprising, since more than 80 percent of the key men in the Indian Bureau come from non-Indian States. They just will not give an Indian a break. Yes; let me say to the gentleman from Tennessee the Indian is a practical farmer and stockman if he has a chance. The purpose of this bill is to give him a chance, and I hope the motion of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations [Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado] shall prevail. It is for the best interest of the Indians. I concur in everything that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] has said in that respect. This is an honest-to-God business deal. If the Government ever wanted honest business in the Indian Department, it will get it by adopting this amendment. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Montana has again expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Senate amendment. I simply want to emphasize in this connection what the distinguished and able chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], has already dwelt upon. This amendment is in fact 42 amendments in a single amendment. It is in fact 42 irrigation items which this House is asked to vote up or down as a whole. Furthermore, it is 42 amendments without a single estimate from the Bureau of the Budget in respect to any one of the 42 items. We are asked to vote today for an initial expenditure, in the absence of any such estimate, amounting to over \$3,700,000 as part of a program, according to my information, amounting to some \$70,000,000, and contemplating an increase in acreage for cultivation amounting to over 440,000 acres.

Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied with the urgency of all the items embodied in this amendment. I am not satisfied, for instance, in regard to the two major projects that have been referred to—projects which it is proposed to start work on for the first time now. I am not satisfied that there is urgent necessity to embark upon those projects at this time.

I am opposed, as a matter of procedure, to being called upon to vote in respect to 42 amendments embodied in a single amendment. I am opposed, as a matter of procedure, to being called upon to pass on large expenditures of this character without any estimate whatsoever on the part of the Bureau of the Budget. I cannot conscientiously vote to embark on a \$70,000,000 irrigation program this afternoon under these conditions.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. AYERS] made a plea for the Indians. Is it not a fact that at the present time we are expending approximately \$50,000,000 a year for the benefit of the various Indian tribes, aside from this proposal?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not have the exact figure in mind; but it is a very substantial figure, of course.

Mr. CULKIN. So that the United States Government does not neglect the Indian. In fact, the Indian is best beloved in the States where he is, where it is said he is one of the chief sources of income.



Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. I would like to make this observation: As a matter of fact, was not the Indian self-sustaining long before he had any contact whatsoever with the white man, and, as a matter of fact, his troubles have been since that time?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am afraid there is a great deal of truth in that statement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona [Mrs. GREENWAY].

Mrs. GREENWAY. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve on the Committee on Indian Affairs and I am glad my colleague, the gentleman from New York, brought up the issue of the history of the unstable policy over many years and the extravagance of that Bureau. I think it should be carefully and finally abolished and the Indians should be given the privilege and opportunity of actual citizenship instead of subsidized isolation as a nation within a nation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to advocate the reclamation projects carried in the Senate amendment pertaining to Indians as a first and absolutely necessary step toward creating the economy that will make possible abolishing of the Indian Bureau. I was going to say that it only cost us from its inception \$2,000,000 up to \$40,000,000, but I notice the gentleman put it at \$50,000,000. Whatever it is, I think it would be cheaper to pension the old people, put the strong men on farms such as this particular project would supply in my State, and to underwrite the vocational education of the youth. I believe we would save money and incidentally we would treat the Indians fairly by making them self-supporting and self-respecting American citizens.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREENWAY. I am sorry I cannot yield; I have but 3 minutes.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentlewoman referred to me. Will she not answer a very brief question?

Mrs. GREENWAY. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. Does the gentlewoman from Arizona believe that it is possible to make a successful husbandman out of the noble red man?

Mrs. GREENWAY. I not only believe it, I know it and have proof of it in the Sacaton development among the Pima Indians of Arizona.

Mr. CULKIN. Are those purebloods?

Mrs. GREENWAY. They are so far as I know.

The Colorado River project in Arizona proposes to duplicate the Sacaton development where Indians were earning their living on individually owned 10-acre plots. It involves a development at the lowest cost of any reclamation project in the United States, \$65 an acre, with a maintenance and operating charge of \$1.50; and it can be developed at the will of Congress over 10 years with 10,000 acres or over 20 years with 5,000 acres. If you do not develop the Colorado River on the American side we shall be held responsible here in Congress for an enormous productive development in Mexico.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Mrs. GREENWAY. In this connection I may say that the projects in my State carried in this bill are self-liquidating. The Salt River Valley has never defaulted in its payments and in 1929 brought the farmers an income of approximately \$26,000,000, and in the depression about \$9,000,000. Under the Senate amendment to this bill they will receive \$2,300,000 toward completing the project for which they received and spent last year \$3,500,000 and which will need only \$1,044,000 more to complete this particular unit.

The other project is the Gila project, which eventually will also be self-liquidating.

Construction of the Gila project at this time is imperative to preserve within the United States rights to the waters of the Colorado River. The project is feasible in every respect, having been found so by both Bureau of Reclamation and by an impartial board selected by the Secretary of the Interior.

Its soil is good. Its production is needed in the West, where no agricultural increases can be made except by irrigation and where populations continue to grow. Its products, because of a warm, dry climate, are specialty crops that do not compete with those of any other section. Production of dates, long-staple cotton, and the like on our reclaimed deserts do not injure farmers in humid sections of this Nation. These things still appear on our list of imports.

The point I really wish to stress is that without this development of the Gila Valley the water of the Colorado River will be allowed to flow into Mexico, where it is available for use—a use which would establish a perpetual right to our water.

We have built Boulder Dam and spent millions in improving the Colorado River and in the conservation of its waters for the benefit of seven of our States that lie in its basin. Now, are we to permit this water, this life-giving water, the greatest resource of our arid West, to flow into Mexico, where it can be used, and where a right to continued use of it can and will be established? If not, we must put it on our land. That is what the Gila project will do. It will use in Arizona, one of the States of the Colorado River Basin, a part of the water for conservation of which we built Boulder Dam.

The Gila project will be constructed in a logical manner by the Bureau of Reclamation. This appropriation of \$2,500,000 and the allotment of \$2,000,000 made last year from emergency funds are to be used in construction of the first unit of the project. This unit is comprised of 150,000 acres of land, virtually all of which is Government land, and all of which is desert. The main canal to this unit will be constructed of sufficient size to permit the carriage of additional water for the entire project when it ultimately shall be completed. For that reason the cost of construction of the first unit is estimated at \$20,500,000. A large portion of this cost will be allocated for repayment to other units when later they are developed. The total acreage of the ultimate project will be about 600,000.

Work is under way on a 17-mile section of the gravity main canal of the Gila project.

Arizona has a vital interest in completion of this project. Without use of the water that is available my State cannot grow or develop. More than two-thirds of the area of Arizona is owned by the Federal Government. The proportionately small amount that is on the State tax rolls must carry the burden of the entire State. Where it can be developed, the public land must be developed so that it, too, may become truly a part of Arizona.

To save our life-giving water, to create new opportunities, to produce noncompetitive crops, and to aid the development of Arizona, of which the Federal Government owns two-thirds, the Gila project must be completed.

These are the reclamation projects that do pay the United States the construction cost and interest charges. Here we sit voting billions of dollars that will never come back to us when we could be putting business projects into being in the United States that would pay; and in addition to that, it would enable us again to produce in the United States those things which will reclaim for the farmer his own domestic markets and stop some of these agricultural imports from all over the world. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN].

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we ought to adopt this amendment at this time in this way. The RECORD shows that this proposition has never been considered by the Budget Bureau; it has never been considered by our Committee on Appropriations. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee is opposed to it. He has come in here and said that if we vote this three-million-and-odd dollars it is going to call for another expenditure of \$26,000,000 and may cost as much as \$50,000,000.

Nobody has denied that this is a proposal to bring into use more land for agricultural purposes. We have too much land in production now.



Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. I cannot yield. I have not the time.

We have too much agriculture now for the domestic market. The gentleman from Montana said that in his neighborhood they were going to use this land to raise sugar beets. We already have a quota on the raising of sugar beets in the United States which the sugar-beet men consider too small. We are not going to lose anything by letting this matter go over until we meet next year and then it can be properly considered. Then we can bring in our own bill instead of having the Senate write our appropriation bills.

The gentleman from Massachusetts directed attention to the fact that in this bill, if we vote for it as the Senate wants us to vote, it will involve an expenditure of \$100,000,000 more than was appropriated 3 or 4 years ago. I do not want to do this sort of thing; and I hope the Members will defeat the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in hopes the motion offered by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] will be agreed to.

The Indians are highly intelligent and many of them work hard and are making an honest effort to support themselves, just as the white people do. In my district there is one little project that will get about \$15,000 out of this appropriation. I recommended this to the Indian Department when I came here, and I was under the impression it would be included in their general recommendations to the Appropriations Committee; however, they did not so recommend it and it had to come in by way of a Senate amendment on motion of Senator STEIWER. This amount should by all means be included.

I may say that the reservation involved is within 120 miles of Portland. Those Indians have a very beautiful tract of land, which includes a forest 40 miles by 30 miles, containing all virgin trees. They want to put in their own sawmill. They want to reservoir some water from the head of the creeks so that they may raise gardens to feed themselves. They want to get some cows. They want to live there. Now, why not give them this opportunity?

Mr. Speaker, this Congress a few days ago appropriated \$102,000,000 to build two battleships which some boy may blow out of the ocean in about a minute with a bomb dropped from an airplane. Now, why fuss over a few thousand dollars which will make self-sustaining thousands of these Indians?

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman just made the statement that he thought it was foolish to build two battleships and spend \$102,000,000 thereon. Does not the gentleman also think we ought to stop spending a few hundred million dollars on some of these other projects?

Mr. PIERCE. But this is an appropriation which if made will be of great value and the money will come back into the Treasury.

Mr. AYERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. AYERS. Is it not a fact, as referred to by our friend, the gentleman from New York, that we are spending \$50,000,000 at the present time in order to maintain the Indians?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes.

Mr. AYERS. If this amendment is passed, our grants to the Indians may be gradually reduced until they will ultimately become self-sustaining.

Mr. PIERCE. The gentleman is correct. I do not agree fully with my colleagues who criticize the Indian Bureau, but there is much truth in what has been so eloquently stated here. It does need some reforming.

Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of Indians in my district, on the four reservations in Oregon. They have their own farms, they have their own stores, they associate with the

white people, and they are highly intelligent citizens. I do not know about the projects in Arizona which have been so eloquently described by my colleague from Arizona, but I am going to take her word for it. I think this is money well spent.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that Mr. Fortier, in charge of Indian reclamations, stated on page 159 of the hearings that these projects would cost \$60,000,000?

Mr. PIERCE. Maybe they will cost that much money. I do not know how much they will cost, but I do know that the money will not be lost to the Government. It will not result in bringing new agricultural projects into competition with agricultural products now being raised. The products raised on these irrigation projects will be used to feed the Indians themselves. They want their own cows. They want to raise their own vegetables so that they may be able to live.

Mr. BIERMANN. They are eating material raised on their lands now?

Mr. PIERCE. Some of them are not having enough to eat. Many of them need this help. If the gentleman will just visit some of these reservations he will find how much they need dairy products and gardens.

Mr. BIERMANN. They do not continue the practice of not eating for a very long period of time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the Members of the House that our committee every year goes over these items covering the Indian tribes very carefully. If we are going to prevent the extinction of the Indians from our country, we will have to furnish them some way of making a living. The pending amendment applies to 13 arid Western States and will furnish money for irrigation purposes in order to permit the Indians to make a living. That is really what it amounts to.

So far as Colorado is concerned, the money is reimbursable and will be taken out of the Ute funds, and some of it will be paid by white settlers. It will therefore come back to the Treasury. The same statement applies to Montana and Wyoming.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this is the humanitarian thing to do for these Indians, who are our wards. This only appropriates \$3,710,500 now and will result in an ultimate appropriation of something like \$26,900,000 at some later time; but even so, if we should not have these Indians in the bread line, and if we are not going to permit them to starve to death, we will have to furnish some means for them to make a living. They can no longer live by hunting and fishing. I feel that the motion I have offered is proper. The Indian Bureau did not get any money from the Public Works Administration last year, and they received none this year. For this reason this item has been included in the pending bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the pending motions.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 45, noes 72.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

So the motion to recede was rejected.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 31: On page 52, line 17, insert: "and to remain available until June 30, 1933."



Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 32: On page 52, line 24, after the word "Interior", insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That a report shall be made to Congress covering expenditures from the amount herein provided for relief of destitution."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 33: On page 66, after line 12, insert: "Sioux Sanatorium and employees' quarters, South Dakota: That in addition to the \$337,500 made available by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, for the construction of an Indian sanatorium and employees' quarters, in South Dakota, a further sum of \$29,875, representing the remainder of the original appropriation of \$375,000 contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1932, and not reappropriated by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, is hereby reappropriated and made available until June 30, 1937, for the construction of such sanatorium and employees' quarters."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 35: On page 58, after line 2, insert: "and to remain available until June 30, 1938."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 39: Page 59, line 11, strike out "\$55,000" and insert: "\$69,000, of which \$4,000 shall be available only for traveling and other expenses of members of the tribal council, or representatives of the tribe engaged on business of the tribe at the seat of government, and \$10,000 shall be available in a permanent revolving fund for loans to cover burial expenses of members of the tribe, and payments in liquidation of such loans shall be credited to the revolving fund and shall be available for loans for similar purposes under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 46: Page 60, line 13, strike out "\$399,000" and insert "\$433,500."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment no. 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: "In lieu of the sum proposed insert '\$432,300.'"

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this is merely to correct the total figure.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 50: Page 62, after line 2, insert: "For acquisition, rehabilitation, and preservation of the Tuskahoma Council House, in Pushmataha County, Choctaw Nation, Okla., \$7,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available, payable from the fund 'Fulfilling Treaties with Choctaws, Oklahoma', now to the credit of the Choctaw Indians of Oklahoma."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment, and I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT].

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this Council House is located at Tuskahoma, in my congressional district, where the Choctaw Indians are established. This Council House is the old capitol of the Choctaw Nation. The Appropriations Committee has recommended that \$7,500 of the tribal funds of the Choctaws be made available for the acquisition and rehabilitation of the Tuskahoma Council House. Indians are all for it and nobody is against it. I hope the item remains in the bill.

I am in receipt of a letter from the Choctaw Council House committee, signed by W. A. Durant, chairman; Victor M. Locke, treasurer, and Muriel H. Wright, secretary, giving something of the history of this, one of southeastern Oklahoma's most historic spots, which in part is as follows:

The last Council House near Tuskahoma was a symbol of the pride, character, and achievement of our forefathers in the Choctaw Nation. In the past the Choctaw people have fostered education of their youth, organized government and the general welfare of their nation. Representative of this spirit, the Council House was erected in 1884 in the central part of the Choctaw country, a region noted for its natural beauty. It is but fitting that the Choctaw people today should cherish this historic building on its original site, as a heritage to the honor of their forefathers and posterity.

Although from time to time, for several years, there have been expressions on the part of the Choctaws for the permanent preservation of the Council House at Tuskahoma, the building with the surrounding 5 acres was finally sold by the United States Government, under provisions of the Atoka and supplemental agreements. This property was purchased by the Southeastern State Teachers' College, at Durant. Some were in favor of tearing down the Council House and moving it 120 miles away to the college campus. The full-blood Choctaws and many others have maintained the building should be preserved on its original location near Tuskahoma as an outstanding historic site in Oklahoma. Up to this time, no definite steps have been taken to preserve the Council House, which is now almost in ruins.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, after line 12, insert the following: "The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States \$105,000 of any funds on deposit to the credit of the Menominee Indians in Wisconsin (except the Menominee Log Fund), and to expend said sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for an immediate per-capita payment of \$50 to each enrolled member of the Menominee Tribe."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, after line 21, insert the following: "The following-named reclamation projects are hereby authorized to be constructed, the cost thereof to be reimbursable under the reclamation law:

"Central Valley project, California: For flood control, improving and in aid of navigation, and to provide for the general welfare in cooperation with the State of California, and for incidental purposes, including irrigation, drainage, and power production.

"Grand Lake-Big Thompson transmountain diversion project, Colorado: To irrigate public lands of the United States and to provide for the general welfare in cooperation with the State of Colorado, and for incidental purposes, including the irrigation of patented land, power production, and flood control: *Provided*, That said project shall include the construction and the permanent maintenance of adequate compensatory or replacement reservoirs, necessary feeder canals, and other incidental works at the most suitable sites within said State; the water impounded by said reservoirs to be used within the Colorado River Basin, and the cost of constructing and maintaining such reservoirs, feeder canals, and incidental works shall be included in the cost of said project and be repaid by the beneficiaries of the water so diverted from said basin: *Provided further*, That said project shall be constructed and operated in such manner as to continuously maintain the normal levels of the waters of said Grand Lake.



"Carlsbad project, New Mexico: To provide for the general welfare in cooperation with the State of New Mexico and for incidental purposes, including irrigation and flood control.

"Deschutes project, Oregon: To provide for the general welfare in cooperation with the State of Oregon and for incidental purposes, including irrigation and flood control.

"Provo River project, Utah: To provide for the general welfare in cooperation with the State of Utah and for incidental purposes, including irrigation and flood control.

"Yakima project, Washington, Roza division: To provide for the general welfare in cooperation with the State of Washington and for incidental purposes, including irrigation and flood control.

"Casper-Alcova project, Wyoming: To irrigate public lands of the United States and to provide for the general welfare in cooperation with the State of Wyoming and for incidental purposes, including the irrigation of patented lands, power production, and flood control."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment, as follows.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado moves to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows: "Strike out the third paragraph in said amendment, in lines 9 to 26, inclusive, relating to the Grand Lake-Big Thompson transmountain diversion project, Colorado."

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Will a motion be in order to consider these items separately?

The SPEAKER. No; there is only one Senate amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I think the House ought to vote down the motion to concur. I am going to demand a division of the question.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on this question there is quite a little demand for debate. It seems to me that we might consolidate the debate on amendments 53 and 54 together and have 2 hours on the two amendments, and then at the end of the debate vote on them separately.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I am willing to agree to 2 hours' debate on the two amendments.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does the gentleman from New York think that is enough?

Mr. TABER. I think we can get through in 2 hours.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the debate be limited to 2 hours on the two amendments nos. 53 and 54.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that for the purpose of debate amendments 53 and 54 be considered together, and that the time be limited to 2 hours, to be controlled by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. MAY. Reserving the right to object, do I understand that at the end of the debate the amendments will be voted upon separately?

The SPEAKER. Undoubtedly the amendments will be voted upon separately. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. THURSTON].

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the title of this bill should be amended by adding a phrase something like this, "Also for the purpose of further distressing and dislocating agriculture."

I hope, I insist, that some subsequent speaker will have the fairness to tell the Members of this House how many hundreds of millions of dollars are involved in these irrigation and reclamation projects proposed in the Senate amendments. It is true that the current amount that would be made available amounts to some \$60,000,000, but surely the sponsors of this proposition ought to have the courage and fairness to come here and tell the membership of this House what the ultimate cost of these projects will be. Surely they cannot presume upon our generosity or indifference to the extent of asking us to blindly make

authorizations for expenditures that will entail a billion and a half or, as some have predicted, \$2,000,000,000 to complete the proposals. Fairness should require those who are interested in this project to make this information available to the Members.

Already it is estimated that irrigation projects have been authorized and are now under construction which will cost at least one and one-half billion dollars. No one knows just how many acres of productive land are involved in these projects, but it is safe to say that one acre of fertile land which receives a constant supply of water through irrigation will produce three or possibly five times as much as marginal or rough land, which is being retired through the soil-conservation program.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it is an astounding situation that we face today. With little or no information in regard to these proposals, it is suggested that we should jack the Treasury for untold millions of dollars. It almost seems incredible that such a brazen, unwarranted expenditure should be seriously proposed. In this Chamber, almost every day since we have been assembled here, one, sometimes several, and oftentimes many Members have told about the plight of agriculture, low farm prices, high taxes, and the inability of those engaged in the farming industry to obtain a fair return to compensate them not only for their endeavors but for the investment they have in their enterprise. Here it is proposed that we should greatly expand the farming area of the country. It is only fair to admit that when there are substantial increases in the population of a country that the completion of some of these projects may then be warranted. We should commend the cleverness and the adroitness of the Members who come from the semiarid section of the country in saying to us, "The additional acreage will not be used to produce more farm products." But the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior sends out very beautifully prepared illustrated pamphlets and booklets showing the extent of the farm production that is being produced in the irrigated districts. I would like my good friends to step into the Republican cloakroom and see the large picture frame with several sections furnished by the Bureau of Reclamation which shows fields of wheat and clover and alfalfa sustaining livestock and other farm products. So it will not do for Members to come here and take this inconsistent position on this floor saying that the addition of these lands to be brought into the farming business will not increase farm production and thereby add to the present surplus production.

Then, I confess I cannot understand the logic of the gentlemen from those sections who are promoting these new farm-land projects, because you know, and I know and everyone knows, that there has been a tremendous number of foreclosures of mortgages in those regions. Why? Because the men who were in the farming business could not make a living. Yet it is proposed to double—yes, quadruple—the production of farm products in those various sections. It seems to me that a distinct injury will be brought to the farmers in those sparsely settled districts who are obliged now to ship their products great distances before they can reach the consuming centers of the country. It is our duty to protect the farmers in the arid districts from additional competition.

I hope the Members, not only from the farming districts but from the city districts, will give careful consideration to these proposals. Members who mainly represent consumers might argue, "Well, if we provide for a great quantity of production it will make cheap food products for our city consumers." That may be true, but if we throw out of employment a vast number of farmers, the people in the city districts, through taxation channels, will be obliged to support and assist those same people. After all, it resolves itself down to the simple proposition: Is this a sound proposal for agriculture? If it is not, it will be harmful to the entire country. I cannot conceive of anyone coming from a purely agricultural section who would contend that this would aid agriculture; that it will not be injurious. Even those in the districts affected, it seems to me, would have



more consideration for the constituents who send them here rather than to provide those same constituents with additional competition. If this motion should prevail, and these projects should be authorized, it would be another sad day for agriculture.

Recently a measure was defeated in the House which would have provided a lower rate of interest for refunding or refinancing farm indebtedness. If those who were so strongly opposed to the low rate of interest for the farmer can justify their support of this bill, which would grant funds to land speculators or farmers who may purchase land in irrigated districts, with no interest for 40 years, it would be interesting to have them endeavor to explain their inconsistency.

Within the past few days we have read of the new reciprocal treaties consummated with France and Finland, and the reduction made in duties, particularly upon dairy products. So it seems that these are rather unhappy days for agriculture. Official reports indicate great increases in imports of farm products.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THURSTON. I yield.

Mr. BIERMANN. Does the gentleman mean to say that the agreement with France provides for a reduction in dairy products?

Mr. THURSTON. A reduction in the duty on cheese; yes. It is true that our people may be able to purchase lace, wine, and perfumery a little cheaper as a result of that trade, but I cannot conceive why it would be an advantage to our people to import more products from cheap-labor countries.

It seems to me that before we vote upon this conference report each Member should attempt to visualize the number of farmers who have land that is heavily encumbered, and whose future existence depends upon an income which will prove sufficient to fertilize the land and repair the buildings and improvements, in addition to an income that will permit the farmer and his family to have not only necessities but some of the luxuries which the average citizen is entitled to enjoy.

Then I want to make reference to this situation: Coming from Iowa, a State which stands first in the major agricultural operations of the country, we know about the competition of cheap lands in Canada, the Argentine, and Australia, the cheap transportation charges for hauling products by water throughout the world. Likewise, the cheap labor levels that exist elsewhere—one-fourth to one-tenth the level of our own country. Of course, we are not only concerned about these reciprocal trades that are being secretly made without notice to those concerned, mainly to trade off the products of the farming sections of the northern portion of the United States for products which we do not need—lace, or wine, or perfume—which we can produce at home.

Recently Chester Davis, the A. A. A. Administrator, gave out a press release that expressed the view that "the United States can never recapture its foreign markets for farm commodities because of the increase of self-sufficiency programs erected by the nations in Europe." He further stated:

I have talked with responsible leaders of government and agriculture in 11 countries, and not one of these countries has failed to equip itself with effective machinery to exclude or to offset exports from our country, no matter how heavily we might subsidize them.

So he bursted the bubble of foreign-market expansion in farm products. Then why should we expand or increase farm production?

So when these other proposals come along to place additional land in cultivation, with no interest charges for 40 years, no one seems to know the exact cost, but it is estimated at one and one-half to two billion dollars, and possibly moratoria to extend the time of payment, if ever it is reached; surely we have a right to be concerned, and we cannot understand why our Government is fostering what we call a soil-erosion program to withdraw land from cultivation, and then placing additional land into farming operation, with a constant supply of water, nurtured by every Federal agency to make it a success. This is contradictory and unsound, and

we hope that the House will register its disapproval of this irrigation program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it seems that in the discussion of reclamation some Members of this House immediately prejudice their minds and get the idea that every dollar that goes into reclamation goes into the pockets of the people in the States where the projects are located. Nothing could be more unfair, nothing more untrue than that conception of reclamation projects.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the hearings before the subcommittee on this question. Mr. Page, the head of the Reclamation Bureau at the present time, made a break-down of how the Bureau is spending its money for major materials going into Boulder Dam, and with the permission of the House I shall read it, for it shows that the money spent on reclamation is not spent in the locality where the project is constructed, but is scattered from one end of the United States to the other; and I know the items I have here are of interest to every man and woman in this House and that the money spent on reclamation goes into every section of the United States. In the break-down of the Boulder Dam project what do we find? I quote below a short extract from the Reclamation Era of July 1935:

A break-down of the Bureau's larger expenditures for materials shows that \$620,535 went to Los Angeles; \$1,049,395 to Birmingham; \$10,908,000 to Barbenton, Ohio; \$172,100 to Elizabeth, N. J.; \$124,684 to Newport News, Va.; \$65,186 to Rockford, Ill.; \$2,405,367 to East Pittsburgh; \$105,989 to Susanville, Calif.; \$1,883,217 to Milwaukee; \$2,185,416 to Schenectady, N. Y.; \$2,086,000 to southern California cities for cement; \$148,160 to Denver; \$419,191 to Gary, Ind.; \$46,090 to Muskegon, Mich.; \$107,023 to Niles, Mich.; \$108,430 to Chicago; \$298,048 to Philadelphia; \$547,825 to San Francisco; \$62,377 to St. Louis; and smaller amounts to more than a dozen other communities.

Following is another tabulation which shows the origin of many millions of dollars spent by the contractor in the construction of that project:

#### SPREAD OF PURCHASES

Firms from which Six Cos., Inc., have purchased equipment, materials, or services in excess of \$50,000 for Boulder Dam contract work and the approximate amounts of the purchases:

Apache Power Co., Benson, Ariz., explosives, \$287,000.  
Bucyrus Erie Co., Milwaukee, Wis., excavating equipment and parts, \$77,000.  
General Motors Corporation, James Cashman, agent, Las Vegas, Nev., motor trucks, automobiles, and parts, \$50,000.  
Caterpillar Tractor Co., Stockton, Calif., and Peoria, Ill., tractors, \$137,000.  
Chapman Lumber Co., Portland, Oreg., lumber, \$127,000.  
Columbia Steel Co., San Francisco, Calif., structural steel, pipe, wire rope, \$1,022,000.  
Consolidated Steel Corporation, Ltd., Los Angeles, Calif., fabricated structural steel, \$504,000.  
Crane Co., Los Angeles and Chicago, pipe, fittings, and plumbing fixtures, \$211,000.  
Crucible Steel Corporation of America, Chicago, Ill., drill steel, \$149,000.  
California Western Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif., locomotive fuel oil, \$113,000.  
Chain Belt Co., Milwaukee, Wis., truck mixers and pump cretes, \$86,000.  
Dorr Co., Chicago, Denver, and Los Angeles, desilting and sand-grading equipment, \$79,000.  
Electric Steel Foundry Co., Portland, Oreg., buckets, \$58,000.  
Elliott Core Drilling Co., Los Angeles, Calif., detachable drill bits, \$79,000.  
Ford Motor Co., Detroit, Mich., autos and trucks, \$96,000.  
Foss Heating & Ventilating Co., Pasadena, Calif., air-conditioning equipment, \$78,000.  
General Electric Supply Co., Schenectady, N. Y., electric supplies and wire, \$425,000.  
Giant Powder Co., Giant, Calif., explosives, \$217,000.  
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio, and Los Angeles, Calif., tires, \$80,000.  
Hammond Lumber Co., Pacific coast points, lumber and mill-work, \$56,000.  
Hercules Equipment & Rubber Co., San Francisco, Calif., and Akron, Ohio, rubber hose and supplies, \$74,000.  
Hercules Powder Co., Herpoco, Calif., explosives, \$500,000.  
Ingersoll Rand Co., of California, Phillipsburg, N. J., Painted Post, N. Y., and Los Angeles, Calif., compressor, air drills, and air hoists, \$501,000.



International Harvester Corporation, Fort Wayne, Ind., motor trucks and parts, \$352,000.  
 C. S. Johnson Co., Champaign, Ill., batching equipment, \$52,000.  
 Kelly-Springfield Tire Co., Cumberland, Md., tires, \$199,000.  
 Linde Air Products Co., Los Angeles, Calif., oxygen, acetylene, and rod, \$177,000.  
 Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Co., locomotives, repairs, and car rentals, \$223,000.  
 Lidgerwood Manufacturing Co., Elizabeth, N. J., cableways, \$145,000.  
 Leschen Wire Rope Co., St. Louis, Mo., wire rope, \$71,000.  
 Marion Steam Shovel Co., Marion, Ohio, excavating machinery, \$431,000.  
 Moreland Motor Truck Corporation, Burbank, Calif., trucks and parts, \$137,000.  
 Mack International Motor Corporation, New Brunswick and Plainfield, N. J., trucks and parts, \$274,000.  
 Mountain States Implement Co., Ogden, Utah, electric fittings and globes, \$51,000.  
 National Equipment Corporation, Milwaukee, Wis., concrete mixers, \$69,000.  
 Paraffine Co., Inc., San Francisco, Calif., building supplies, \$109,000.  
 Pioneer Rubber Mills, Pittsburg, Calif., belting and hose, \$53,000.  
 Pacific Wire Rope Co., Los Angeles, Calif., wire rope, \$130,000.  
 Standard Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif., gasoline, lubricants, and fuel oil, \$557,000.  
 Union Hardware & Metal Co., Los Angeles, Calif., light and heavy hardware, \$501,000.  
 Union Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif., gasoline lubricants and fuel oil, \$562,000.  
 Union Pacific System, freight, \$1,585,000.  
 United Commercial Co., San Francisco, Calif., rail, cars, and locomotives, \$251,000.  
 United States Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio, hose, insulated wire, \$52,000.  
 Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., electric motors and transformers, \$293,000.  
 Western Wheeled Scraper Co., Aurora, Ill., dump cars, \$65,000.  
 White Motor Co., Cleveland, Ohio, trucks and parts, \$106,000.

Following is a break-down of the Bureau's larger expenditures on the Grand Coulee project:

States and the extent to which they have benefited so far follow: Wisconsin, \$123,048.18; Washington, D. C., \$2,600; Utah, \$2,410.54; Tennessee, \$201.71; Pennsylvania, \$744,-201.22; Ohio, \$654,139.33; New York, \$1,151,894.45; New Jersey, \$535,049.55; Montana, \$51,498.24; Missouri, \$55,598.50; Minnesota, \$129,727.21; Michigan, \$53,539.85; Iowa, \$76,-359.92; Kansas, \$10.73; Kentucky, \$3,960.70; Maine, \$3,166.64; Maryland, \$42,771.23; Massachusetts, \$99,391.06; Oregon, \$170,719.13; Rhode Island, \$2,651.06; Texas, \$68; Virginia, \$792.10; West Virginia, \$5,451.36; Washington, \$2,659,531.60; Alabama, \$1,000; Arkansas, \$456.38; California, \$632,240.89; Colorado, \$40,257.88; Illinois, \$1,296,718.94; Connecticut, \$60,371.29; Delaware, \$33,370.95; Florida, \$252.73; Georgia, \$2,008.02; Idaho, \$3,289.45; and Indiana, \$1,861.63.

Another argument made against reclamation projects is that agricultural products raised on reclaimed land enter into competition with surpluses from the Middle West. This is absolutely untrue, unsupported, and unjustified by the hearings before the subcommittee. The Haw-Schmitt committee made this observation with reference to agricultural products on reclamation projects:

Of the staples affected by curtailment on quota assignments the amounts produced on the reclamation projects are insufficient even for local supply, with the exception of cotton and sugar. Moreover (and this is probably true even of sugar and cotton), the increase in consumptive demand in the West directly chargeable to reclamation development is more than enough to absorb their production.

I also desire to quote from Mr. Page's testimony before the House Committee on Appropriations:

They also found that the total crop value on reclamation projects was made up largely of those items which are now being imported. Many irrigated areas do not supply sufficient agricultural products to support their own communities. For example, dairy and poultry products, and pork and pork products are now being shipped from States in the Mississippi Valley by trainloads to Los Angeles and other Pacific coast cities; yet all the Federal reclamation projects lie between the source and the destination of these shipments.

It happens that in the present legislation that you are considering my district has no projects at all, and I think that a greater length of the Colorado River runs through

my district than probably any other district in these Western States.

Now, we are up against this proposition on the Colorado River, and I hope that this House will take this view of it:

Since the construction of Boulder Dam we have equated the flow of the Colorado River so that now it is possible for people to appropriate that water in Mexico; and, as I am informed, there are millions of dollars of American capital ready to appropriate all available waters of the Colorado River in the country of Mexico.

Now, I think that this House, and also the Senate, should bear this in mind: That once this great natural resource of the United States is appropriated in Mexico it forever precludes its appropriation in the United States; and I think that at this time, rather than take the view that these projects along the Colorado River are not worthy of consideration, it is the duty of this Congress, in order to protect that great natural resource, to have every survey necessary made to determine every feasible project on that river, so that that great natural resource will be conserved for the people of the United States, where the water originates, rather than let it flow into Mexico where, if once appropriated, it is lost to this country forever. I hope that the House will bear that in mind.

Under the doctrine of appropriation, once that water is appropriated in Mexico, regardless of agreements or anything else, we cannot get it back, and we are forever bound to let it flow down there.

Here is one other observation that we might make: After spending the vast amount of money which has been spent on Boulder Dam, then, in order to protect the very life of that project, projects above it, on the Colorado River, should be determined and worked out for the protection of that great national asset. I believe that this House, regardless of where the Members come from, should look at reclamation from the national aspect; and bear this in mind at all times—that in the very States where these reclamation projects are anywhere from 90 percent in the State of Nevada down to 40 percent of the land in other States is owned by the Federal Government; not by the people of those States but by the Federal Government; and every dollar that goes into reclamation ultimately returns to the people of the United States. So this cannot possibly be construed as a "pork barrel" proposition. The very break-down on Boulder Dam shows a very wide distribution of every dollar that is spent for reclamation.

I do not know whether the facts I have brought out mean anything to the Members of the House or not, but I do know that when a committee is appointed to make a survey of the very question involved in the bill under discussion today, and that committee reports back to the House, certainly what they say should mean more than general statements coming from the opposition to reclamation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CUMMINGS].

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I do not know from which side I should have asked my time. I asked it, however, from those in favor of irrigation.

Mr. Speaker, I come from the West and own irrigated land, and I think I know what it means. I want to tell you Members who are alarmed over the increase in crops that might come from additional reclaimed land that the total of the crops grown on irrigated land is less than 1 percent. I think I am at liberty to talk on either side of this question for the reason that the chairman of the subcommittee was so kind as to move to strike out the irrigation project in which I was most interested, the Grand Lake project. This project proposes to bring water from the western slope to the eastern slope in a country occupied at the present time by more than 600,000 people. It is a supplemental supply to 800,000 acres of irrigated land on which we produced last year during the sugar season over 80 cars of sugar per day. We fed last year more than 1,000,000 lambs. Ninety percent of all the lambs that are winter-fed in the



United States are fed on alfalfa that is grown on irrigated land. May I be permitted to say, Mr. Speaker, that every irrigation project should be considered by itself and decided on its own merits. If you were to ask me if all the irrigation projects provided for in these amendments should be voted for by this House, I would say "no", because there are bad projects there that would cost this Government \$1,000,000,000 and which could not be paid for within a period of 50 or 60 years.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUMMINGS. I have too little time to yield.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman indicate—

Mr. CUMMINGS. I will not indicate anything. On the other hand, there are good projects and they should be provided for. My present idea of irrigation and reclamation is to furnish a supplemental supply of water for projects already completed and to complete the real projects that have been started. But we should not go into these matters merely upon the theory that a billion dollars does not mean anything.

Some people make the statement that the projects will never be paid off. I would not go as far as to say they may never be paid off, but I will state that they will not be paid off in 40 or 50 years' time. In the case of some of these projects, where it is a supplemental matter, such as the one I am interested in, the money will be paid, because there are 800,000 acres of irrigated land there now. There are over 600,000 people living there. There are 12 sugar factories located in there and another factory being erected for processing sirup and sugar. That project is just as good as a Government bond. But, as I said a moment ago, if I had to place my stamp of approval on the entire bill and come before the Members of the House and say that all of these projects were good, I would have to say "no", even if mine went with the rest of them.

The chairman of the subcommittee very kindly sought to cut out my project at Grand Lake, which is one of the best of the whole bunch. Mr. Page, who is now head of the Irrigation and Reclamation Bureau, stated it was one of the best irrigation sections in the United States. Anyone who knows anything about irrigated land knows this is true. Of course, I could tell why it was cut out and could give you a lot of the inside story, but it is rather poor policy to wash your dirty linen in public.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to a few things with reference to the cost of these projects and return of the money. Any good irrigation project, if it is worthy of the support of the Government, in 10 or 12 years will return money in the way of income taxes. I venture to say that the income payments from my district, the Grand Lake district, would more than pay the interest, and I would venture the further statement that the increased products will more than pay the interest. If you have ground that will probably produce 10 tons of beets to the acre under normal conditions, if you will allow extra water the production will run up to 15 tons to the acre.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, as I enter into a discussion of the reclamation projects listed in this conference report, I want to state that I am not personally opposed to all reclamation work. I feel this work has an important place in the development of our country, but on the other hand I feel that with one department of our Government making every effort possible to take land out of production or shift a large portion of our producing acreage to legumes and grasses that we are now facing the anomalous situation of spending Government funds to take lands out of production on the one hand, and on the other we are appropriating and authorizing the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars to bring arid lands into production.

In checking this conference report it is not my intention to go into every individual project, but I note this report appropriates and authorizes for such projects as the Gila

Valley in Arizona, which has a potential acreage increase of 700,000 acres, the Central Valley Authority in California with 780,000 acres listed, although potentially it is reported to have a possibility of 1,000,000 acres. The Grand Coulee project in the State of Washington has a potential possibility of 1,200,000 acres. There are many further authorizations in this report. We who are representing agricultural States realize how hard it is to reduce the producing acreage in this country to the needs of domestic consumption and the average annual export market. In 1934 through the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program we were able to take out of production or shift the production on 35,000,000 acres of our productive farm lands. For this the farmers of this country received \$594,000,000 in rental and benefit payments. In 1935 we took 30,336,838 acres out of production, for which the farmers were paid \$579,257,003.97.

During this session of Congress we have passed additional legislation to assist the farmers in adjusting their crop acreage to the domestic requirements, plus whatever exportable market we might be able to secure. For this we have voted an appropriation of \$400,000,000. I merely mention this because I want to call the attention of the House to the utter impossibility of spending large sums of money to assist agriculture in adjusting its farm problem, and call to your attention the inconsistency of today authorizing the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars for reclamation work. Statements will no doubt be made that our Government is purchasing submarginal lands and taking them out of production, and therefore we will soon need this additional acreage.

Yesterday I contacted the Resettlement Administration in regard to land purchases and find that up to April 30, 1936, the total acreage purchased is 1,419,569 acres at a cost of \$6,641,848. The total remaining acreage to be purchased under this present program is 8,305,171 acres, involving an expenditure of \$34,500,542. The Resettlement Administration has also purchased under their resettlement program for rehabilitation 5,386 acres at a cost of \$390,796. Further plans contemplate the purchase of 767,725 acres, involving a total cost of \$26,674,485. The Biological Survey received \$12,000,000 from the emergency drought and relief fund to purchase two and a half million acres of submarginal lands of which 1,010,000 acres have been purchased.

Secretary Wallace, in his report issued March 1935, states that his analysis of the agricultural situation indicates that if the acreage needed to supply domestic requirements and exports of agriculture products is not materially increased in the years just ahead, it cannot be expected to exceed 340,000,000 to 350,000,000 average acres of harvested cropland. That is, 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 acres will be required for exports, 285,000,000 to 290,000,000 acres for domestic consumption, and 20,000,000 to 25,000,000 acres for the production of nonfood products.

The actual acreage of cropland harvested averaged 360,000,000 to 365,000,000 acres for the period 1928-32. As a result, this country is faced with an excess acreage equivalent to 10,000,000 to 25,000,000 harvested acres of cropland, at average yields, provided the land is left idle. A shift of 20,000,000 to 40,000,000 acres would be required if intensive crops were replaced by hay and pasture and no land left idle. If the adjustment is affected by retiring submarginal cropland, an acreage equally as large or larger would be required.

Everyone familiar with the farm problem realizes that if we are to have a prosperous agriculture we must maintain our farm producing area at a size that will meet the supply and demands of our markets.

Dr. Alonzo E. Taylor, director of the Food Research Institute of Stanford University stated at the recent annual Dearborn conference on agriculture, industry, and science that in his opinion we must permanently abandon 1,000,000 American farms embracing 250,000,000 acres as a means of putting agriculture on a paying basis. He stated that the basic need after nearly two decades of futile political treatment of farm reliefs is to reduce the present 1,055,000,000 acres



now in farms to the 800,000,000 acres needed for future production and spread the total income of farmers among 2,000,000 fewer farm people. For the past 3 years the agricultural-adjustment program and the severe droughts have materially assisted in securing increased prices for agricultural products, but with returning normal conditions agriculture again faces a serious situation.

It is interesting to note that the wholesale commodity price index compiled by the National Fertilizer Association as of May 16, 1936, shows that the price index dropped to the lowest point since the first week of last year, and makes the further comment that the sharp decline in the index in the latest week was due to lower prices for farm products and foods, as the index representing the prices of all commodities other than these two groups remained unchanged. They state that since the first week of the year the all-commodity index has registered a 4.3-percent decline and the farm-products index has fallen off 9.6 percent. They further state that the third consecutive sharp weekly recession in the farm-products price index reflected lower quotations for most grains and livestock and that the only farm products showing any advance during this period were cotton, rye, and live poultry.

In view of these statements, it seems to me that Congress should hesitate to vote large sums of money for reclamation purposes until we have at least established a coordinated land-use policy. It seems to me it is ridiculous to have one branch of our Government appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars to assist the farmer in reducing his acreage, and, on the other hand, appropriate and authorize the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars to bring land into production.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman approve the plan of Dr. Taylor, as mentioned in the article he just quoted from?

Mr. CARLSON. I approve the plan of purchasing submarginal land and getting our agricultural lands down to where they will take care of domestic production, and then export whatever surplus we have.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman approve of the abandonment of good farms, as advocated by Dr. Taylor?

Mr. CARLSON. No.

Mr. WHITE. What are we going to do with the unemployed in this country, which now number some 12,000,000? Does not the gentleman think they have to be shifted back to where they can make a living?

Mr. CARLSON. I shall have to refuse to yield further, but I will say that we will never take care of the unemployment problem and the agricultural problem of this country by bringing into production large tracts of arid land, when we now have surplus land and are trying to get it out of production.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. STUBBS].

Mr. STUBBS. Mr. Speaker, all California has its eyes on the House of Representatives today. We are considering the usual annual appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior, which this year includes an appropriation for a general reclamation program of the entire West, and among the items for which we seek funds is the great central valley project of California. I say that all California has its eyes on the House of Representatives today because the entire State's population recognizes that California's future rests with the fate of this appropriation item. Two great inland areas, the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys, as big in size as Italy, and from which the metropolitan areas of San Francisco and Los Angeles draw the food supplies necessary to feed their millions of inhabitants, will progress or retrogress with the success or the failure of the appropriation which we seek.

Facts and figures, particularly when they deal with an engineering project, are dull to those who are not directly

affected, and I do not intend to discuss them at any great length today, because they are available almost everywhere in Washington. Several Federal agencies have studied this project thoroughly and every one of them has placed its stamp of approval on the project. It remains only for us, the Congress, to concur in their fact finding.

For those of you who have never had the supreme pleasure of visiting or residing in California, let me report that it is a veritable Garden of Eden, one of the finest agricultural areas of the entire world—this, in particular, applies to the Sacramento and the San Joaquin Valleys.

Constant irrigation, over a period of years, has depleted the water supply in the lower San Joaquin Valley, and one of the project's objectives is to move water from the upper part of the Sacramento Valley down into the San Joaquin Valley, a distance of about 500 miles—from New York, say, on the Atlantic coast, down through New Jersey and Maryland, past the District of Columbia, through Virginia and deep into North Carolina. An ambitious plan, I agree, but feasible, according to reputable engineering talent which has studied the project. The project also is designed to correct flood-control problems of the Sacramento Valley, the saline problem of the agricultural lands of the San Francisco delta area, it will improve navigation far up the Sacramento River and provide cheap electrical energy for a metropolitan area which soon will require far more "juice" than private plants can now supply.

There is no opposition, apparently, to the plan of repulsing the sea water which annually encroaches upon the delta area and destroys thousands of acres of specialty crops. There appears to be no opposition to the plan of developing navigation on the Sacramento River. Everyone agrees that the control of flood waters on the Sacramento River is a worthy movement.

The opposition to the production of cheap electrical power comes from a source so common to all of us that it is needless for me to elucidate. Needless to state, cheap power is as important to irrigation areas and metropolitan districts as any factor. In addition, however, this program does not contemplate the destruction of private electrical production plants now in existence. The power which will be produced from this project will simply supplement that which already is being produced. The new power would not be available for almost 5 years and by that time we will have real need of it.

Opposition to the plan of irrigating our arid agricultural lands of the San Joaquin Valley seems to lie in the belief that we intend to place thousands of additional acres in production. Such is not true. We simply are striving to preserve the productive territory which we have been irrigating for many years. We do not plan to place a single additional acre under cultivation unless the national need justifies it.

Our crops are specialty crops, largely, and do not compete with those of the North, South, or East.

This project contemplates the construction of a series of dams, reservoirs, power plants, canals, pumping stations, transmission lines, and a vast and intricate irrigation system. Its cost, \$170,000,000, is very liberally estimated, and I am advised by the best of the engineering profession that it will not cost a nickel more. But regardless of its cost we are only seeking \$16,000,000 this year, and we have the best security in the world to offer as surety.

As evidence of the fact that the cost of the project is not prohibitive, and is justified, let me advise you that we produce in 1 year out there—in the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys—agricultural crops with an aggregate value far in excess of the \$170,000,000 which the entire project would cost. Surely it is worth the price of 1 year's production to save two of the greatest and finest agricultural areas of the entire world.

The fate of 20 great countries are directly at stake and the expansion of the San Francisco and Los Angeles metropolitan areas are indirectly affected.



There are more than 1,000,000 people, 300,000 of whom are farm folks, residing in the affected area. The land area in the two valleys constitute 28.3 percent of the State's entire land area. The balance of the land in the State is largely mountainous and the two valleys are the principal agricultural districts.

Unless we can assure ourselves sufficient irrigation water in the future our lands will meet the fate met by those in the dust bowl of the West. Our topsoil today is being plucked from the ground by constant winds and being deposited on the sides of mountains where it is of no value to agriculture.

We need the project. The Nation needs it. The administration has approved it. It is sound from an engineering, legal, financial, and social viewpoint. It would provide work for several thousand skilled workers of the East, who would be placed at work producing the material need for the construction program. It would save great agricultural and industrial areas from economic oblivion. All of the major and minor problems associated with a project of this magnitude have been solved during the 30 years it has been under consideration. This project may be new to you but it is not to those of us from California, for the State has spent more than a million dollars on preliminary surveys and it is estimated that Federal agencies have spent about \$5,000,000 more.

My primary interest, naturally, lies with the Central Valley project, but I would be short-sighted, indeed, if I spoke only of it, when I firmly believe in the necessity for an all-embracing and comprehensive reclamation program for the entire West, such as the one contemplated by the Senate amendments to this departmental appropriation. My remarks on the central valley project are, to a large degree, applicable to the general reclamation program under discussion here today.

I agree with the opponents of the program that reclamation and rehabilitation are costly. Everything worth while is costly. I care not, however, what the cost may be, reclamation and rehabilitation of our western agricultural lands is worth the money—particularly when that money will be repaid. The argument of the opposition that this money will not be repaid is based upon a fallacy. It will be repaid. Reclamation has always paid its way. It will pay even bigger dividends in the future. The Federal Government is the nominal guardian of every acre of land in the country, and it is our duty, as the legislators of the Nation, to protect our agricultural areas, no matter whether they are located near or far from our own particular bailiwick.

Reclamation is a policy which visions the needs of tomorrow. Our present economic plight can be laid directly at the door of our failure to look ahead, and if we do not possess a long-range view on reclamation the entire West is doomed to become an arid waste. Gentlemen who would like to see everything west of the Mississippi become known as the great American desert will be working nicely toward their objective if they vote to reject this reclamation program.

If we retard reclamation, we retard the normal expansion of our agricultural industry of the West. The products raised in California, for instance, are not in direct competition with those of northern, southern, and eastern agricultural areas. Our products are specialty crops in general and supplement those of other sectors of the country. Why should there be objection on the part of my colleagues if we continue to grow oranges, lemons, peaches, almonds, grapes, and a hundred and one other agricultural products which help make the West a vast granary for specialty agricultural products? These products add materially to our national wealth. They not only mean more to the housewife of the East, who is anxious to make her meals tastier by employing them, but they mean buying power for the millions who reside in the West, who constitute a great purchasing population for the manufacturers of refrigerators, automobiles, furniture, steel, farm implements, and a thousand and one articles which are manufactured in the East and sold in the West.

Reclamation is a long-time investment program. Those of us in the West, who have watched the advancement of reclamation from its very infancy, are in a position to know of what we speak, and I am confident that anyone who will study the subject will agree with me that reclamation is one of the best forms of security possible to obtain.

If we were asking for an outright grant, or a sum of money beyond the realm of possibility, or if we were not in a position to offer you security for the money which we seek, I would understand the opposition to this program. Why anyone should associate himself with a political movement designed to destroy a program of this nature is beyond my ken, and either denotes a thorough lack of knowledge of the subject or a complete disregard for the welfare of the Nation, which should automatically bar him from participation in this discussion and balloting.

I ask those of you who are not residents of the West to view this reclamation program in a broad-minded manner, and I request your forbearance in solving our problems. We of the West have worked shoulder to shoulder with those of you from the North, the South, and the East in solving the tornado, drought, and flood problems which have afflicted you, and now we bespeak your cooperation in this, our hour of need. [Applause.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, may I at the outset commend, with all the vigor I possess, the extremely patriotic and national stand of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN]?

Today, the Budget of the United States is unbalanced in the sum of \$6,000,000,000. Today, the United States is headed directly for inflation. Today, the United States is headed directly for economic destruction. Its recovery must depend, if we read history aright, upon the balancing of the Budget.

Here we find a singularly contradictory proposition, a proposition which brings this Congress into national disrepute and, to my judgment, threatens its very existence. Under these circumstances, when we are passing through a depression, when we have 12,000,000 unemployed to feed, the Senate of the United States sees fit to tie onto this piece of legislation appropriations which will ultimately amount to \$1,500,000,000.

Why, may I ask, has the foresight and the patriotism that characterizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, disappeared from the Senate? Are they thinking of their elections? Are they living only in an atmosphere of locality? They have lost the national outlook, an outlook upon which must depend the existence of this Congress and the staying of the growth of fascism which will soon engulf America if the House and Senate continue to demonstrate their impotence.

These items that have been put in this bill by the other body come definitely within the category of "pork". They are nothing short of "pork." The A. A. A. was spending \$1,500,000,000 to retire 35,000,000 acres of land from production, while this mad disbursement goes on to bring more land into production. Then we pass the Soil Erosion Act, and under that act 25,000,000 acres are to be retired from production so that agriculture may obtain parity prices. We will expend \$400,000,000 a year to do that. Then in the same breath—and there is nothing like it, nothing more contradictory in the history of civilization or in the history of parliamentary government—while we are retiring 5,000,000 acres from production, the Senate of the United States, aided and abetted by the call of locality in this House, asks that this House vote to disburse, ultimately, \$1,500,000,000 for the purpose of bringing 4,000,000 more acres of land into production. I could discuss this matter at length. There are many phases of it. One of the gentlemen here a moment ago referred to the Haws-Smitt report. Haws is a railroad economist, and the railroads bring these people



into these hopeless reclamation propositions and then take them out again, if they have enough left to pay their fare. Mr. Smitt is the editor in chief of the Engineering Age, I think it is called. This magazine carried an article, or a series of articles, in which Mr. Smitt condemned every single project mentioned here. Some of the other projects mentioned here were then unborn.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture, through the medium of the Grange and the Farm Bureau Federation, has served notice upon this House and upon this Nation that this business of giving the farmers added competition must cease. Agriculture is tired of that ancient and hoary and bearded fiction which says that irrigation simply increases crop production 1 percent. This absurd fiction has been blasted repeatedly, and, Mr. Speaker, I shall ask permission to extend in my remarks tables which show an increase in agricultural production in different fields due to irrigation running from 3 percent in cereals, which include wheat, up to 30 percent.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CULKIN. For a brief question.

Mr. COLDEN. Is the gentleman from New York repudiating the reclamation and irrigation policy of President Hoover, Secretary Ray Lyman Wilbur, United States Senator Hiram Johnson, and our former colleague, Mr. Phil Swing, as well as other eminent Republicans?

Mr. CULKIN. I will say to the gentleman that his question is more or less adroit and I would expect that type of question from the able gentleman from California. I may say to him that his question does not bear upon this proposition at all. In none of those administrations, I may say, Mr. Speaker, were such gigantic propositions involved. I call them empire-building propositions, in the background of which is an intent, if you please, to transfer our population out to these new lands when they become irrigated. Not long since I had a gentleman from Wyoming in my office and he was arguing with me about that absurd fiasco, Casper-Alcova, that has been condemned by nearly every agency of the Government, and he said to me, "What the hell do you care, CULKIN? We are not going to take any farmers from your State into Wyoming. We are just going to take them from Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska, and what do you care about that?" This is the proposition in a nutshell. Some portions of the West, which, by the way, are now receiving 98 percent of their relief out of the Federal Treasury, are in an empire-building spirit when they seek these vast and absurd appropriations which I say threaten not only the existence of popular government but threaten more particularly the continued existence of this House. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this is not the first time that progress and development in this country has been opposed on this floor. I am reminded of a great speech made here by that eminent and distinguished gentleman, Proctor Knott, when it was proposed to build a railroad into Duluth. I wish I had memorized that great epic.

I wonder what would have happened if my friend from New York [Mr. CULKIN] had been on the floor at that time and such advice as he is giving us had been followed? Where would that great country of Minnesota be today? Where would the markets be for products of his State if we had never developed that country?

I remember when I was a boy I got hold of my grandmother's old geography and it showed the country west of the Mississippi River at the great American desert into which the adventurous people of that day went to settle and build great communities and develop irrigation and show the people how to put water on the land to raise crops.

I have heard the gentleman from New York oppose irrigation projects which water the land and utilize the power

that now goes to waste in the West. It is now proposed as a policy to utilize that power.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa where he expects to market his crops of corn, pork, and lard? Where would his markets have been if we had not developed this great country in the West?

The appropriation we are considering is to carry on the great plan of development that was started by the party of the gentleman from New York. He would stop further development and progress and leave the country in the condition it is now. I am wondering what he would do with the 12,000,000 now unemployed when we propose to give them means of relief by creating irrigated farms where they can settle, build homes, and become self-supporting.

Mr. THURSTON. Let me say to the gentleman that we would take care of our own products. If we can get rid of the reciprocal agreement with Cuba, we can raise all the sugar we need. We can raise all the beet sugar that now comes from foreign countries.

Mr. WHITE. This country falls far short of producing the sugar we consume now.

If industry cannot provide the means for caring for those out of employment, a way must be found to put surplus population on the land where they can become self-supporting.

Is it the contention of the gentleman that we must arrest development at this time and that we have no more interest in the building of communities and the settlement of the country and provide places where people can become self-supporting and take a living from the ground just as our forefathers have done?

Mr. THURSTON. Whenever we have sufficient population to absorb some of these projects, then the proposals of the gentleman might be sound.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman speaks about sufficient population. What are we going to do with the 12,000,000 excess population we have today, for whom we have to appropriate billions to take care of?

Mr. THURSTON. I reiterate that we should protect the American market for the American producer. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITE. That is a controversial question and enters the realm of politics.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who speak on this conference report today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. GREEVER].

Mr. GREEVER. Mr. Speaker, in the short time that has been allotted to me I do not propose to speak a great deal about any specific projects except those in my district, and also to say something about the general program of reclamation.

At the outset I want to say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN], who just spoke, and who has spoken for a long time against the reclamation program, spoke about some man from Wyoming who wanted some of the people from his State to come to our State. I want to say that I am not trying to get any of his people away from him, nor am I trying to get any from Idaho. The gentleman, of course, was talking about somebody else.

The appropriation bill for the Interior Department, as amended by the Senate, contains items aggregating approximately \$58,000,000 for reclamation throughout the Western States. The distinguished gentleman from Colorado, chairman of the subcommittee, has pointed out with remarkable clarity and conciseness the general benefits to be obtained from this program, and I do not wish to deal generally with the benefits of reclamation, for they have been gone into very carefully here and have been discussed thoroughly and are well known, but I should like to discuss a few things with



reference to the projects which appear in this bill and more especially those within my own State.

In the first place, I want to reiterate what has been so ably pointed out with reference to the fact that money expended for reclamation projects is repayable to the United States. I further wish to point out the fact that until the advent of the Public Works Administration, reclamation had not cost the Government of the United States one cent.

A total of approximately \$210,000,000 has been paid into the reclamation fund to date from the sale of public lands, timber, and oil royalties in the Western States. Of this amount, \$43,000,000, or more than one-fifth, has been contributed from the sale of lands and from oil royalties within the State of Wyoming.

The great Casper-Alcova project which is under discussion here is located within Natrona County, Wyo.; and while I do not have the exact figures before me as to the total amount contributed from lands in Natrona County, yet I think it is safe to say that considerably more than one-half of the \$43,000,000 has come from oil royalties within that county. During the past several years, due to oil development in that community, a city of approximately 25,000 people has grown up in Casper. It is one of the finest communities in the West and possesses a citizenship of which any State might well be proud. Due to the fact that there has been very little oil development in the past few years, this community has met financial reverses, with the result that a great number of highly skilled workmen formerly employed in the oil fields and in industries appurtenant to the oil fields have been thrown out of work. Natrona County is entitled to this project. You are giving her nothing for which she has not paid in full.

The wise founders of the reclamation policy were western men, who proceeded upon the theory that funds derived from the depletion of one natural resource in the great West, from whence has come billions of dollars of the Nation's wealth in lumber, oil, livestock, gold, silver, and other minerals; and they believed it was only fair and a sound economic policy that when one or more natural resources were being depleted that it was only fair that a portion of the money derived from the sale of these resources be placed into funds which would replace in some small degree that which had been taken away by replacing with that money another natural resource. This is the theory upon which reclamation is predicated. It is the theory under which it has been carried out, and it is the theory upon which laws were passed placing 52½ percent of the oil royalties which were received by the United States Government from public lands to the credit of the reclamation fund for development of arid lands.

So I say to you that when you are appropriating moneys for this well-balanced policy of reclamation, you are not giving money away but, on the contrary, you are merely lending money which will be repaid fully to the United States by those who are engaged in agricultural pursuits in the West.

The Casper-Alcova project will cost approximately \$19,000,000, of which the water users will repay \$80 per acre and the balance will be used for the construction of power plants and dams for such power. Much of this electrical energy will be used in the development of resources in which the surrounding country abounds. The Reclamation Service has made a survey of the power needs which can be served from the Seminole Dam, which is a part of the Casper-Alcova project, and it is found there will be a demand for this power within the next 10 years which will take up the entire capacity of the power plant and which will amply repay the cost of the dam and power plant. A detailed study of the sale of the power from the plant was made by H. F. McPhail, engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation, dated September 21, 1933, wherein it was stated that the cost of the power system, including the Seminole power plant, transmission lines, and substations, would be repaid with 4-percent interest, similar to the Boulder Canyon project set-up.

Casper is the center of a very large cattle and sheep industry, and thousands upon thousands of cattle and sheep are raised in the territory adjacent to Casper. The chief difficulty with the raising of livestock in this country has been a lack of forage crops and the lack of lands available for the raising of such crops, with the result that it has been necessary to ship out in the fall of the year large numbers of cattle and sheep because of the lack of feeding facilities. This has resulted very often in an upset in the livestock market and has resulted in a lack of stabilization because of inability to ship the cattle and sheep to the market as the market demanded them. The crops which will be raised upon this project will consist largely of forage crops and will be used as an adjunct to the livestock industry. They will not create a surplus in any crop whatsoever where agricultural surpluses have existed in the past. In addition, the city of Casper affords a large market for dairy and other domestic products which up to the present time has not been fully developed, due to lack of proper irrigated lands in the vicinity.

In Western States, as in Eastern States, the question of rural resettlement has become acute. There are great numbers of good farmers who have become discouraged through drought and through the ownership of submarginal lands who are not able to produce a proper living upon so-called dry lands. A goodly number of these people have already moved to irrigation projects and have availed themselves of the opportunity to develop lands which will not only produce a good living but which will repay their cost to the United States Government. It is a significant fact that in the last 4 or 5 years, immediately upon the building of laterals which will carry the water to newly irrigated lands, these lands have been applied for and have been taken up by people under the provisions of the Reclamation Act as soon as they were available, and there is no question but what the same thing will happen upon every foot of the land proposed to be irrigated under the terms of this bill.

The Hart Mountain project, for which an appropriation of \$1,000,000 is provided in this bill, is a part of the Shoshone project and was authorized in 1909. Work has already started upon the project and is proceeding satisfactorily. It has provided work for a great number of people. The storage capacity was completed in 1910 and is available. The moneys being appropriated for the Hart Mountain project are being used for the purpose of constructing canals, ditches, and laterals. I personally know of many first-class farmers who are anxious to secure lands under this project. This will result in a most constructive and economic solution of the very bad plight in which some of these farmers now find themselves, due to drought, ownership of submarginal lands, and so forth.

There is included in this bill also \$900,000 appropriation for the Riverton project, which is to be used for the construction of what is known as the Bull Lake Reservoir, to provide an additional water supply to the lands under that project. This project has been settled as fast as new units become available, and it is remarkable the progress in building that has taken place upon this project within the last few years.

Whenever a reclamation project is opened it immediately begins to create new wealth. I made an investigation just recently to determine the shipments of goods from the manufacturing regions into one of our projects at Powell, Wyo.; and in spite of the fact that most of the shipping into that territory is done by truck from Billings, Mont., and Denver, Colo., I observe that this town had received 27 carloads of automobiles and trucks from Michigan and Wisconsin, 4 carloads of corn from Nebraska, 11 carloads of machinery from the East, 82 carloads of gasoline, 5 carloads of phosphates, 25 carloads of coal, 38 carloads of lumber, 3 carloads of salt, 8 carloads of cement, and 73 carloads of miscellaneous shipments, making a total of 276 carloads. I assume that only one-third of the goods shipped into that community are shipped by rail. I would assume that two-thirds are shipped by truck from Billings, Mont., and Denver,



Colo., which, if true, would make the total shipments in the neighborhood of 800 carloads, which, at the rate of \$2,000 per car, would amount to more than one and one-half millions of dollars, all of which is paid for out of newly created wealth. In addition to this, this community has a most favorable reputation for the payment of its taxes and other obligations. There have been created hundreds of fine farm homes, with good schools, churches, and other community activities. This is typical of the entire reclamation area throughout the West. Farmers have settled upon these projects from every State in the Union, and most of them have been successful. I should be very much interested in knowing the exact figures, were such available, as to the amount of newly created wealth by reason of the policy of reclamation, but I should imagine that, in terms of produce and transportation, it has amounted to a good many billions of dollars and, in addition, has resulted in a constructive resettlement program.

To properly cover all of the phases which should be covered in any talk concerning the reclamation program would require much more time than we have available here today, but I want to impress upon the Members of the House these very important facts:

First. That the reclamation program has been entirely carried out, up to within recent times, without the loan of 1 cent from the Federal Government.

Second. That of all moneys becoming due from reclamation projects, more than 98½ percent have been repaid.

Third. That the moneys used for the construction of reclamation projects, up until the Public Works Administration, were all from the sale of lands and from oil royalties.

Fourth. That the crops raised are noncompetitive in character and are used very largely as an adjunct to other agricultural activities.

Fifth. That the communities and settlers upon reclamation projects have provided a vast market for the farm machinery, parts of farm machinery, automobiles and trucks, steel, lumber, coal, furniture, radios, hardware, electrical appliances, and every conceivable kind of goods manufactured within the boundaries of the United States.

Sixth. The reclamation program has provided a comprehensive and well-balanced program of rural resettlement.

I trust that the conference report, with the amendment, will be agreed to. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KNUTE HILL].

Mr. KNUTE HILL. Mr. Speaker, a long time ago Horace Greeley said, "Go west, young man; go west." But the last great frontier for homesteading has gone forever. There are only three ways in which we can build for homes now. That is by irrigation as we do in the West and in the South, by drainage as they do in the South, and by soil conservation. We are building for homes in the West. We are building for the future. We are going to take care of the millions of the Middle West and the East, as much as you dislike to let them go, who in time will have to look for homes.

You speak of the fact that we are taking land out of cultivation. Yes, we are, but what is it? It is marginal land and submarginal land, and we are planning to invite these people out to the great Northwest, where they can find homes in districts where they can make a fine living on land that is irrigated.

This policy was started years ago. It was opposed then as it is opposed now.

I have here some extracts from such men as General Goethals, Mr. Hoover, Mr. Work, ex-Secretary of the Interior, and Mr. Wilbur, also ex-Secretary of the Interior. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that these may be incorporated in my remarks, to show how those men stood on this question of western irrigation and to prove that this is not a partisan question. The present administration is promoting policies of preceding administrations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WHAT PROMINENT ENGINEERS, ECONOMISTS, AND STATESMEN HAVE SAID ABOUT THE COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

"It (the Big Bend or Columbia Basin project) is believed to be feasible. The Columbia River on the north and west and the Snake River on the south flow through deep and rocky gorges too low to be feasible for irrigation purposes except by pumping." (Report of U. S. Bureau of Reclamation in 1903.)

"The soils of the (Columbia Basin) area are especially high in the mineral elements to which fertility is often ascribed. The area possesses one of the best agricultural climates on the continent." (Reports, U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1911 and 1923.)

"It is feasible from an engineering standpoint to build a dam here (at Grand Coulee) even 350 feet high above low-water level and to pump water 300 feet in height into the Grand Coulee for the rehabilitation of the drought-stricken Columbia Basin farm lands. The power developed would be a great asset in making the project feasible. This project merits the fullest investigation, and certainly core drilling should be done to determine the depth to bedrock." (Statement of A. P. Davis, Director, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, made at Grand Coulee dam site in 1920.)

"The Columbia Basin project possesses the following favorable features: An abundance of water, no adverse engineering difficulties, a splendid climate, and long growing season, and easily irrigated land, much of which has been tilled. The productivity of this land has been amply proven by results obtained from irrigation on small tracts within the area." (Report of State Columbia Basin Survey Commission in 1920.)

"The Columbia Basin project is as much a national one as were the Panama Canal and the Alaskan Railways and will, if completed, add much more to the national wealth than either of the others mentioned. In our judgment the project is feasible, not alone from the standpoint of construction but from that of economics as well." (Report of Maj. Gen. George W. Goethals, builder of the Panama Canal, made in 1922.)

"The Columbia Basin project should be considered as one of the great future assets of the State and Nation." (Report of Special Columbia Basin Commission, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, in 1925.)

"Just as sure as time passes the Columbia Basin project will be built. The Columbia Basin project is a natural asset of national appeal. It is an inland empire of land, water, potential power, and sunshine in the Northwest awaiting development." (Statement of Dr. Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, after inspecting the project in July 1925.)

"The initiation and construction of the Columbia Basin irrigation project is inevitable. It should be undertaken at the earliest possible date. I have familiarized myself with the engineering problems involved, and the time to begin this great undertaking is now." (Statement of Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, when he visited the project in August 1926.)

"Much of even this expenditure would be directly recovered from the land and from the leases of byproduct power. At this moment we could not make economic use of the whole of this power or of all of this land or all these inland waterways, but we will need the whole of it within half a generation. And at this moment we have an urgent need for beginning certain major projects which will in themselves require years for completion." (From address by Secretary Hoover in Seattle on Aug. 21, 1926.)

"I am decidedly in favor of the Columbia Basin project. It is not only important to the food supply of the Nation in the early future but it is timely to meet the existing economic situation." (Statement by Secretary Hoover in Washington, D. C., on Mar. 30, 1927.)

"Reclamation of arid lands is not a local question but a national one. Yesterday I stood on a mountain and I could see a sea of arid land that would be fertile if it had water on it. I saw, too, laid off like squares on a checkerboard, areas that had been abandoned by the men farming them. It seems to me that Congress can well afford credit that would enable that land to be flooded with water." (Statement by Nicholas Longworth, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, upon his inspection of the Columbia Basin project in 1927.)

"The Columbia Basin project is not far distant." (Statement by President Calvin Coolidge before the Union League Club of Philadelphia on Nov. 17, 1927.)

"The (Columbia Basin) project fits ideally into President Hoover's plan. What a pity it could not have been ready the first of this year to give work to some 50,000 people. When it is started in a big way and the necessary financing is arranged, there will be a tremendous employment of labor. The Columbia Basin project will pay large and increasing dividends." (Statement by B. C. Forbes, publisher of Forbes Magazine, when he personally inspected the Columbia Basin project on July 19, 1930.)

"As we are spending hundreds of millions to deal with the Mississippi and its branches, so we celebrate here this new control of the Colorado. In turn will come our other river systems, particularly the Columbia. For industry, agriculture, trade, and commerce, our river systems must be mastered for the future safety of our increasing population." (Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of Interior, at Boulder Dam celebration in 1930.)



"Examination of the reports of the Bureau of Reclamation and of the Chief of Engineers of the War Department leads without difficulty to the conclusion not only that the construction of the Columbia Basin project is highly desirable but it is both physically and financially feasible under the plan contemplated by the proposed legislation for the development of power and for the utilization of power profits—after repaying the cost of power development—in amortizing, together with water users' repayments, the cost of the irrigation developments in such units and at such times as economic conditions may justify." (Statement of Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of Interior, in a letter to Robert S. Hall, chairman, Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, House of Representatives, on May 20, 1932.)

"Proper development of the Columbia River would doubtless create a great asset for that section of the Nation where it is located and, of course, in so doing, it would be a national asset as well as a local asset." (Statement by Patrick J. Hurley, Secretary of War in 1932.)

"Whereas the present plans of the Coulee Dam are for a low dam only and the cost of changing to a high dam later will be \$30,000,000 more than if the high dam were built now; and

"Whereas we believe that building the low dam will make it very difficult if not impossible to build the high dam; and

"Whereas we believe the full resources of the Columbia River should be utilized and not be throttled by building a dam that will be inadequate later: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Washington State Grange is on record as being in favor of building the high dam now rather than attempting to raise a low dam later." (Resolution passed by the Washington State Grange at its annual convention at Everett, Wash., in June 1935.)

Mr. KNUTE HILL. Mr. Speaker, there have been mistakes made by the Federal Government in this development, but we are doing all we can to take out marginal lands in the West as well as in the Middle West. That is being corrected. Certainly there was speculation. There were all kinds of promotion schemes. The Federal Government is doing away with that. For example, in the Kittitas proposition at Ellensburg they are taking out speculation. They arranged it so that land could be sold only at a certain reasonable price. There is also the matter of water waste that has been going on for years, and that is being taken care of. They are using their water to better advantage. They learn by experience.

May I call attention, especially the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to the fact that the President's Budget provided for these projects named in amendment no. 53. The President is for this. Why? Only for one reason, because he has been out there and has seen with his own eyes what can be done with water. I wish some of these friends of ours who are opposing us today would come out and breathe our exhilarating air, would fish in our sparkling streams, would look at our majestic mountains; but, above all, if they would come there and see the desert sagebrush land, 1 year after it has water on it, blossom like the rose and be changed into beautiful and comfortable homes.

Although this Senate amendment deals with many western projects I desire to speak on the particular project known as the Roza unit of the Yakima project. This is the last unit of a quarter of a century program. The other units have been completed, more than 90 percent of the funds have been repaid to the Federal Government, and these lands have yielded products worth hundreds of thousands of dollars. What was once a barren waste is now a fruitful valley, the home of an intelligent, prosperous, industrious people. Of course we have suffered from the depression. But, may I ask, what section of our country has not suffered. However, the chambers of commerce representing our cities, the granges and farm bureaus representing our farmers, and labor organizations representing our laborers have all wholeheartedly endorsed the High Coulee Dam and the Roza. And why should they not? They are residents of the Yakima Valley and have seen its population increase from 13,462 in 1900 to 77,402 in 1930; its tax valuation increase from \$25,004,000 in 1900 to \$233,041,000 in 1930; and the value of its products during this period approximate a half a billion dollars on a loan from the Government of about \$33,000,000, most of which has been repaid.

The Federal Government finished the Cle Elum Reservoir at a cost of \$2,813,000 to impound waters for the Roza.

Last year the sum of \$4,000,000 was allocated to construct tunnels, and dam work has begun and contracts have been let for this purpose; however, only up to the amount of \$2,500,000. For this reason the President in March withdrew \$1,500,000 of the original sum to take care of flooded districts of the East and other imminent necessities. Now we are simply requesting that a \$2,500,000 allocation be made so we can proceed with the completion of this unit as a component part of the Yakima project. It will furnish labor for the present unemployed, it will provide homes to the thousands of seasonal workers who are needed in the fields and packing houses of the dozen cities of the prosperous irrigated sections adjoining the Roza unit on the south.

It has been stated here that we have an overproduction. Is there too much food with millions of people in want of the bare necessities? Is there too much cotton and wool with other millions without the necessary clothing for comfort and decency? Let us resolutely set our faces toward the dawn of a new day when the problem of just distribution shall be solved, providing labor and homes for all. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KNUTE HILL] has expired.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN].

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report. If I did not do so, I would not be true to myself or to the splendid and intelligent constituency which I have the honor of representing in this Congress. This report seeks to authorize seven gigantic irrigation projects in seven different States with an ultimate cost to the taxpayers of this country of approximately \$1,500,000,000. If the appropriation sought here is approved and the projects completed, the New Deal will have added around 5,000,000 acres of new irrigated land, in the arid States of the West, to the already overabundant supply of tillable farm lands now available for productive cultivation.

I do not blame the gentlemen from the seven Western States for sponsoring this appropriation; but when I realize that the 5,000,000 acres of irrigated land which they seek to create will produce the equivalent in farm products of 15,000,000 acres of good nonirrigated land, I must insist that the appropriation be defeated so as not to further dislocate existing agriculture, and for the general welfare of the entire country.

These irrigation projects have not been authorized by Congress. The sponsors of the appropriation state that the President has spent large sums out of relief funds on all of these projects and that he has given his approval and now asks Congress to provide these large appropriations so that the work may be completed and the new land opened to cultivation. It should not be done. I am opposed to any irrigation and reclamation work at this time. The people I represent are opposed to it. When the population of the country has increased to such an extent that it becomes necessary to have more farm lands in order to take care of our needs, then Congress can consider the problem in a regular and orderly manner and make necessary authorizations and appropriations.

Why in the name of common sense does the President and his Democratic leaders put their stamp of approval on the creation of millions of acres of new irrigated land in this country? The President and his advisers—Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace, Dr. Rexford Tugwell, and Mordecai Ezekiel—have claimed for the last 3 years that our farmers are producing too much in the agricultural field and that because of large surpluses of farm products the farmers of the United States were induced by them to take 40,000,000 acres of good tillable land out of usual production in order to produce less. Under the same theory of surpluses, our farmers were also induced to prematurely dispose of 6,410,866 pigs and hogs, of which number 5,105,067 were converted into grease and fertilizer. They still claim that we produce surpluses; but now they come and ask Congress to



vote appropriations of more than \$1,000,000,000 so as to create millions of acres of highly productive land, I suppose, to produce more surpluses. It just does not make sense to me.

#### DISLOCATION OF AGRICULTURE

Agriculture is a delicate machine. It is easily dislocated or thrown out of balance. Over long periods of time agricultural diversity in specialized crops became an established fact in this country. Ten States in the South specialized in the production of cotton and tobacco. The people in these sections purchased their dairy, pork, meat, and grain supplies from the farmers in the upper Mississippi Valley; and our people in the North, not being able to raise cotton or tobacco, bought their supplies of these commodities from the farmers of the South. It was a fair exchange, and both groups benefited by it.

The farmers of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa, and other States became specialists in the dairy, corn, hog, cattle, and poultry branches of agriculture. The efficiency in the production of these products became so great that the farmers in these diversified areas could without difficulty supply the needs of the entire country. Often surpluses of dairy products would appear to glut the market. While the dairy production would many times appear to approach the surplus line, I do not believe that we have ever had a real overproduction. Rather, the surpluses of butter and other dairy products were caused by the use of substitutes which were manufactured from imported vegetable oils and fats into oleomargarine and cooking compounds. During the last 3 years, and particularly in 1935, the domestic dairy structure has been further jeopardized by the enormous imports of butter and other dairy products.

Now let us see what is taking place under the new program. For 50 years or more the Middle West has supplied the South with the diversified products of the North. Owing to climatic conditions our section cannot raise the products of the South, but the farmers of the South can easily grow the farm products of the Middle West. Twenty millions of acres of cotton and tobacco land have been taken out of cultivation in the cotton and tobacco States. The administration did not want this land to remain idle, so the leaders in the Federal Government encouraged and helped finance, out of public funds, the growing of corn, alfalfa, clover, and other feeds for hogs, dairy cattle, and livestock on the land that had heretofore been used in the production of cotton and tobacco. And what are the results? During the last 3 years dairying, livestock, and hog production in the South has increased by leaps and bounds. Creameries have been and are being built in all sections, and it will not be long before dairy production will be on a large commercial scale in direct competition with the old-established dairy sections of the Middle West. Packing plants are also being constructed in the strategic points of the South to handle commercially the increasing supply of cattle and hogs for slaughter.

We could not object if this change in production came about in a normal and gradual manner; but when the Federal Government steps in and with the taxpayers' money finances a large group of farmers to go into direct competition with farmers in other sections, we surely have a right to protest and make every possible attempt to prevent complete dislocation of American agriculture.

It is not my purpose to criticize the policies and expenditures for agriculture during a time of emergency. The A. A. A. no doubt served a useful purpose. Objections were raised against centralized control and regimentation. I know that the millions of checks sent to the farmers helped increase the income of those who received them. In my opinion, the farmers of the country must have their income and purchasing power restored before we can have complete recovery for all branches of our complicated economic structure.

Let me return to the subject under discussion in the House. I have just stated that agriculture in this country is being dislocated. A little thought on the subject will convince anyone of that fact and that something must be constructively done before the whole country gets out of kilter.

#### IMPORTS OF FARM PRODUCTS

Another reason why I am opposed to the President's irrigation and reclamation demands is the uncontroverted fact that during the last 3 years, when the majority of our farmers were trying to comply with the New Deal philosophy of scarcity by taking nearly 40,000,000 acres of productive farm land out of usual cultivation, the present administration permitted to be imported into this country an excessive quantity of cheaply produced foreign farm products of the same kind as our own farmers took out of cultivation. In other words, when our farmers produced less cattle, corn, hogs, wheat, rye, barley, butter, and other farm crops in order to cut down the surplus, the administration literally invited foreign farmers to increase their cheap foreign production of the same products and to ship them to the United States and sell them in the American market in direct competition with domestic production.

The effect of the policy of giving our American market to foreign farmers is threefold. First: The domestic market is being flooded with cheaply produced foreign farm commodities which have taken a part of the home market from our own farmers. However, the greatest damage done to the American farmer is the effect that these large imports have had upon depressing and reducing the home-market price level on domestically produced farm commodities.

The tables of imports, which I will insert in the RECORD, show that the competitive farm imports for 1935 exceeded a declared foreign value of more than \$750,000,000. All of these farm imports were or could have been produced in this country by American farmers and laborers in sufficient quantity to more than take care of domestic requirements. This huge sum was a direct loss to agriculture in the United States. The next loss was the price-depressing factor of such a large quantity of imports. Reliable authorities estimate that because of the large competitive imports for 1935, the farmers in this country were compelled to take more than \$2,000,000,000 less by way of lower prices for their products sold in our own home market.

Second. The President and his advisers, who are now advocating increases in agricultural and manufactured imports into this country, state with great acclaim that the quantity of imports is only a fractional part of our domestic production, and that no damage is being done. Well, let us examine the record. Remember that our farmers took about 40,000,000 acres of good farm land out of cultivation so as to produce less. Then look at the farm imports for 1935, and you will find that the consumers in the United States provided a market for foreign farm products cheaply raised on from 25,000,000 to 30,000,000 acres of foreign farm land. This production belonged to our American farms, and any other theory spells for destruction of the entire country.

If our farmers are to cut their acreage and production because they are producing too much, then it must be elementary and sound reasoning that they should be entitled to the home market without foreign competition for that which they raise for sale at home. I favor the expansion of our foreign trade, but I do not believe in the idea advocated by the new dealers that it should all be done at the expense of our American farmers.

Third. At the beginning of 1936, the American Federation of Labor estimated that there were more than 12,500,000 unemployed in this country. This is the largest number of unemployed we have had in the United States. With the Federal spending of more than \$24,000,000,000 during the last 3 years, it would appear that by now there should have been a material decrease in the number of unemployed. But this is not the case.

One of the main reasons for the increase in the unemployment and relief rolls is the fact that jobs and work, which rightfully belong to American labor, were given to the cheap labor of other countries. A break-down of agricultural imports for 1935 into persons employed will disclose that from 2,500,000 to 3,000,000 persons could have been employed in the United States in the production and processing of the imported commodities if the same had been produced here. Because of these imports the jobs to produce them, including pay checks, went to foreign labor



instead of our own citizens, and the consumers in this country paid the bill. About 50 percent of these unemployed live in the cotton States. The balance are scattered throughout the country in grain, corn, hog, and dairy sections. These unemployed farm hands were driven to join the relief rolls, which now have a grand total of more than 20,000,000 persons, with no end in sight.

Prominent labor leaders have stated that if it were not for the imports of cheaply produced competitive manufactured products now coming into this country, there could be gainfully employed in private industry nearly 3,000,000 persons who are now out of work and on relief. This makes a total of nearly 6,000,000 Americans who would have work if the New Deal would save the home market for American farmers and laboring men.

#### RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

We have all heard a great deal about the trade agreements which have been negotiated by the President and his Secretary of State with foreign countries and particularly with Canada. The tariff duties in these agreements were lowered up to 50 percent of existing rates, and a large percentage of the reductions were made effective on competitive agricultural commodities despite President Roosevelt's promises at Baltimore on October 26, 1932, when he said:

I know of no excessive high duty on farm products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire program.

The President did not keep his sacred pledge to the farmers. On January 1 of this year he put into effect the crowning achievement of his administration in the form of a trade agreement with Canada. Dairy, livestock, and poultry farmers were required to bear the major sacrifices of this trade. Protests were lodged by farm organizations and farm leaders against any reduction of agricultural duties, but these were brushed aside in the merry scramble to give away the domestic market to foreign farmers. We love our Canadian neighbors and wish them well, but we believe that in a time of emergency it is the duty of the President of the United States to first take care of his own citizens, according to promises, before showing preference to people of other countries.

It has been impossible to secure figures on farm imports from Canada since the treaty went into effect from any United States department, but in order to show the increased trend of agricultural commodities from that country, I quote from a recent news dispatch from Ottawa, Canada, wherein W. D. Euler, Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce, said:

Pronounced gains in exports to the United States of leading commodities affected by the Canadian trade agreement were recorded during the first 4 months of 1936. Agricultural products and lumber were the heaviest gainers. The export value of swine increased

from \$3,000 to \$390,000, while the number of cattle increased from 39,000 to 75,000 and the value from \$2,262,000 to \$3,605,000. Cheese exports increased from \$21,000 to \$407,000.

There you have the story, and the same thing is taking place with every other country in the world, for the cut in duties to one country is equally available to all other countries, except Germany. These agreements should be canceled.

What will the future bring? The present program is filled with confusion and contradiction. It can be summed up in a line or two. Surpluses; destruction; cut production; change production; irrigation; reclamation; importation; reciprocal-trade agreements; more importation; dislocation of existing agriculture; no permanent program. What is it, and where do we go from here?

#### A PERMANENT AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Emergency measures were, no doubt, necessary during the crisis, but now the time has come to formulate and make effective a sound and permanent program in order to avert another emergency. The adoption of such a permanent program is not a political or partisan matter. It should have the attention of the best minds of the country. Personally, I feel that the problem can be solved by holding fast to American ideals and doing the job in the American way.

I would first protect the home market for agriculture and labor. Second, I would cancel the reciprocal-trade agreements and then build up our foreign trade by the establishment of a two-price system so that our farmers could enjoy a higher domestic price for virtually 90 percent of their production which is sold in the home market, and sell the surpluses in the foreign market at a competitive world price. This suggestion is nothing new, as it was originally proposed in the McNary-Haugen farm bill, and generally understood and favored by the farmers of the country. The losses incurred on the sale of the surpluses could well be borne by an equalization fee generally collected or an export bounty paid out of the Treasury. If we are to continue a program of curtailed production, then it should be fundamental that the home market must be protected for home production. Third, the adoption of soil-conservation and soil-erosion programs of equal benefit to all branches of agriculture will be for the general welfare of the entire country. Fourth, irrigation and reclamation projects should be discontinued. Fifth, the lowest possible rate of interest should be available to farmers and home owners. Sixth, reduce Government costs so as to lower tax burden.

I would begin with the above suggestions as a part of a sound and permanent program for American agriculture. Possibly the simplicity of these suggestions make them appear difficult, but my own conviction is that if we can put them into effect we will be on the way to a real recovery for agriculture as well as prosperity for the entire country.

TABLE 1.—Imports from foreign countries of farm products and merchandise for consumption in the United States for 1932, 1933, 1934, 1935, and first 3 months of 1936  
(Import figures from U. S. Department of Commerce)

Groups of imports	1932	1933	1934	1935	January, February, March 1936
Total value of imports.....	\$1,322,774,000	\$1,433,013,000	\$1,636,003,000	\$2,038,637,930	\$570,264,451
Group 00. Animals and animal products, edible <sup>1</sup> .....	45,028,000	43,889,000	48,965,000	74,708,519	20,833,327
Group 0. Animals and animal products, inedible <sup>2</sup> .....	80,112,000	118,427,000	109,610,000	151,127,431	48,497,116
Group 1. Vegetable food products and beverages <sup>3</sup> .....	361,863,000	362,797,000	468,897,000	566,440,855	158,793,041
Group 2. Vegetable products, inedible, except fibers and wood <sup>4</sup> .....	123,542,000	162,763,000	222,058,000	282,121,473	77,940,752
Group 3. Textile fibers and manufactures <sup>5</sup> .....	244,038,000	264,155,000	240,224,000	306,701,119	97,341,692
Group 4. Wood and paper <sup>6</sup> .....	168,115,000	170,016,000	181,454,000	208,343,001	50,205,679
Group 5. Nonmetallic minerals <sup>7</sup> .....	96,138,000	65,643,000	86,519,000	103,824,869	25,064,978
Group 6. Metals and manufactures, except machinery and vehicles <sup>8</sup> .....	74,155,000	116,608,000	129,859,000	177,052,196	48,844,858
Group 7. Machinery and vehicles <sup>9</sup> .....	8,493,000	8,551,000	11,799,000	14,524,008	4,140,984
Group 8. Chemicals and related products <sup>10</sup> .....	47,852,000	59,287,000	65,117,000	68,715,572	21,350,046
Group 9. Miscellaneous <sup>11</sup> .....	71,435,000	60,878,000	71,500,000	85,068,887	17,751,978

<sup>1</sup> Group 00 consists mainly of cattle, meat, hogs, pork, animal oils and fats, dairy products, poultry, eggs, and fish.

<sup>2</sup> Group 0 consists of hides, leather, footwear, furs, animal oils, and greases, and horses, mules, and other animals.

<sup>3</sup> Group 1 consists of all grains, feeds, vegetables, fruits, nuts, coffee, tea, spices, sugar, and beverages.

<sup>4</sup> Group 2 consists of rubber, gums, drugs, oilseeds, coconut oil, seeds, tobacco, nursery stock, and miscellaneous vegetable products.

<sup>5</sup> Group 3 consists of cotton goods, jute, manufactured cotton and linen goods, wool, carpets, silk, and other manufactured merchandise.

<sup>6</sup> Group 4 consists of logs, lumber, manufactured millwork, paper, newsprint, and cork.

<sup>7</sup> Group 5 consists of coal, petroleum, cement, glass, pottery, asbestos, and precious stones.

<sup>8</sup> Group 6 consists of iron ore, steel, other metals, manufactured and crude cutlery, nickel, precious metals and tin.

<sup>9</sup> Group 7 consists of electrical and industrial machinery and apparatus, farm machinery, and other manufactured articles.

<sup>10</sup> Group 8 consists of coal tar, medicinal preparations, industrial chemicals, soap, cosmetics, fertilizers and paints.

<sup>11</sup> Group 9 consists of photographic goods, musical instruments, toys, sporting goods, firearms, books, clocks, artware, matches, tooth brushes, pencils, pipes, combs, buttons, and beads—all manufactured products.



TABLE 2.—American farm market given to foreign farmers and laborers—Imports from foreign countries of specific farm products for consumption in the United States for 1932, 1933, 1934, 1935, and first 3 months of 1936  
[Import figures from U. S. Department of Commerce reports]

Imports of specific farm commodities	Quantity			1935			January, February, March 1936
	1932	1933	1934	Quantity	Value	See notes below	Quantity
Cattle.....head.....	98,000	65,000	59,000	364,623	\$8,497,117	(1)	100,419
Beef, fresh and canned.....pounds.....	24,553,000	42,475,000	47,968,000	86,882,032	6,425,903	(2)	24,492,595
Hogs: Pork, ham, bacon, shoulders.....do.....	5,802,000	2,923,000	1,654,000	13,908,176	2,473,180	(3)	10,219,389
Butter.....do.....	1,014,000	899,000	1,253,000	22,674,642	3,576,942	(4)	3,627,855
Corn.....bushels.....	344,000	160,000	2,959,000	43,242,293	20,291,889	(5)	3,637,682
Barley.....do.....		23,657	6,580,000	4,839,678	3,747,509	(6)	116,443
Barley malt.....pounds.....		109,183,000	193,728,000	320,622,537	9,043,234	(7)	43,896,900
Oats.....bushels.....	53,000	132,000	5,580,000	10,106,903	2,939,349	(8)	10,705
Wheat.....bushels.....	10,026,000	10,317,619	18,543,000	38,870,398	30,400,000	(9)	10,270,878
Rye.....do.....		8,006,000	7,622,000	9,642,523	4,755,012	(10)	19,567
Fodder and feed.....value.....	\$2,270,000	\$4,192,000	\$7,593,000		12,923,153	(11)	\$1,477,715
Tallow.....pounds.....	502,000	239,000	42,813,000	245,850,922	13,104,280	(12)	24,029,895
Cottonseed oil.....do.....			9,157,000	166,687,367	8,880,256	(13)	43,830,299
Flaxseed.....bushels.....	5,154,000	13,578,000	15,028,000	17,559,000	15,623,121	(14)	3,795,794
Eggs.....value.....	\$813,000	\$500,000	\$443,000		1,679,093	(15)	\$433,854
Molasses.....gallons.....	186,781,000	169,936,000	220,461,000	247,805,335	12,456,809	(16)	28,424,718

<sup>1</sup> If the 364,623 head of imported cattle from Canada and Mexico had been raised in this country, they would have consumed feed from approximately 729,246 acres of corn hay, and pasture land; 14,584,920 bushels of corn, 364,623 tons of hay and other feeds. Loss to American farmer and laborer \$8,497,117.

<sup>2</sup> The imports of 86,882,032 pounds of fresh and canned beef from Argentina, Canada, Brazil, New Zealand, and Australia represent 217,211 head of cattle weighing 800 pounds each. If this beef had been produced by American farmers it would have taken 434,442 acres of good farm land to provide the necessary pasture and feed, to wit: 8,688,440 bushels of corn and 217,211 tons of hay. Loss to American farmer and laborer \$6,425,903.

<sup>3</sup> The imports of 13,908,000 pounds of pork from Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Japan, Canada, and other countries represents 104,521 hogs weighing 200 pounds each. If raised and fed in this country they would have consumed 2,508,504 bushels of corn grown on 62,712 acres of idle corn land and furnished employment to hundreds of idle persons. Loss to American agriculture more than \$2,473,180. The imports of pork, bacon, ham, and shoulders for the first 3 months of 1936 is not far from the total imports for the entire year of 1935.

<sup>4</sup> The total imports of all dairy products, including cheese, butter, milk, at foreign value amounted to \$15,000,570. An additional \$2,500,000 can be added for freight, duties, and other charges. These imports for 1935 came from Bulgaria, Russia, Greece, Italy, Latvia, Poland, Argentina, Japan, Syria, New Zealand, and other countries. Reduced to terms of milk, these imports amounted to 1,118,000,000 pounds. At 4,000 pounds per year for the average milk cow the American farmer lost the production from 279,000 head of milk cows. It would have taken approximately 837,000 acres of corn, hay, and pasture land to produce the necessary feed. In addition to pasture, the cows would have consumed 11,160,000 bushels of corn, 419,000 tons of hay, and other feeds. Dairy farmers in this country lost around \$20,000,000 on these imports and thousands of farm hands were thrown out of work as a result of this unwise policy.

<sup>5</sup> 1,000,000 acres of good American corn land could have been used to produce the 43,242,291 bushels of imported corn in 1935 thereby providing work for thousands of unemployed and more than \$20,000,000 in additional returns to the corn farmers in this country.

<sup>6</sup> Barley and barley-malt imports equivalent to more than 14,000,000 bushels of barley coming from Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Poland, and Canada, cost American barley farmers and maltsters more than \$12,500,000 and the use of 700,000 acres of good domestic farm land.

<sup>7</sup> Oats imports of 10,106,903 bushels prevented the American farmers from using 200,000 acres of domestic land and a loss of \$3,000,000.

<sup>8</sup> Wheat imports of more than 38,870,000 bushels (bond wheat included) cost American farmers and laborers more than \$30,000,000 and the use of 3,000,000 acres of wheat land.

<sup>9</sup> Rye imports of 9,642,000 bushels from Poland and other countries cost the American farmers around \$5,000,000 and the use of 640,000 acres of domestic farm land.

<sup>10</sup> Imports of fodder and feeds cost the farmers of this country \$12,900,000 and the use of 1,000,000 acres of farm land.

<sup>11</sup> Tallow imports which should have been supplied from domestic livestock cost American farmers and laborers \$13,000,000.

<sup>12</sup> Cottonseed-oil imports for 1935 amount to 14 percent of our domestic production. 1,000,000 persons in the South were thrown out of employment as a result of these imports. The cotton farmers in this country would have used 3,400,000 acres of idle cotton land to produce 1,600,000 bales of cotton so as to secure 532,000 tons of cottonseed for crushing into 166,687,367 pounds of cottonseed oil. Loss to cotton growers and workers from \$50,000,000 to \$100,000,000.

<sup>13</sup> Flax farmers of the Northwest and California lost more than \$15,000,000 and the use of 1,750,000 acres of domestic land because of flaxseed importations during 1935.

<sup>14</sup> Farm wives and poultry raisers lost more than \$1,600,000 on account of importations of eggs from Japan, China, and Hong Kong.

<sup>15</sup> Molasses importations represent a loss to American corn farmers of more than \$12,000,000 and the use of 1,000,000 acres of corn land to produce the necessary 41,000,000 bushels of corn required in the manufacture of 247,805,335 gallons of molasses.

NOTE.—The above farm imports are but a small fraction of agricultural products imported into this country. The table is given to illustrate one reason for depressed domestic prices on farm products, and that the American market is being given to foreign farmers. These importations can be curtailed or stopped by the President, as he now has the authority to increase all duties 50 percent above the present rates in order to save the market in this country for the American farmer and laborer, but instead of doing so, he and his Secretary of State are negotiating trade agreements with all foreign countries and reducing duties upon competitive agricultural and manufactured products up to 50 percent of present rates, thereby causing our home market to be flooded with cheaply produced foreign products.

One of the most striking illustrations of the effect of imports upon our domestic price level is found in the trade agreement with Canada. This agreement became operative on January 1, 1936, and the reductions in duties granted by the administration to Canada also granted the same reductions to all other countries in the world except Germany. During the first 4 months of the present year 178,752 head of cattle were imported into this country under a 50-percent cut in duty, as compared with 144,000 head for the same period in 1935, and 59,000 head for the entire year of 1934. About 50 percent of these cattle were shipped in from Canada, and the balance from Mexico and other countries. This flood of imported cattle caused a glut on the livestock markets at South St. Paul and Buffalo, as well as other border markets, and forced the domestic price down from \$3 to \$5 per hundred pounds. Market figures will show that during the last 4 months any livestock farmer in Minnesota has taken a loss of from \$50 to \$65 on a good to choice steer weighing around 1,300 pounds. Increase of imports is one of the main reasons for lower prices to farmers on livestock at a time when prices should either be advancing or holding their own. While it is difficult to estimate the losses on the price of cattle, expert accountants have calculated that for the year 1936 the American livestock farmers will lose from \$50,000,000 to \$100,000,000 on the livestock because of imports and lower prices.

#### LABOR RECOGNIZES IMPORTANCE OF PROTECTING HOME MARKET

Laborers and farmers will be interested in observing the position taken by all labor organizations in this country with reference to the protection of the home market for labor and agriculture. These organizations formed the America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, with Mr. Matthew Woll as their president. I will quote from a letter recently received from Mr. Woll and from the table of comparative costs of a few imports prepared by this organization.

Mr. Woll said:

America's workers cannot secure employment, let alone secure higher wages, when products comparable to what they produce, produced in foreign countries, are delivered into American markets at delivered prices which are less than American costs of production of comparable goods.

America's farmers cannot secure higher prices for their products when products of foreign nations are delivered into American markets at prices which are less than our costs of production, which prices of foreign products govern the prices our American farmers must accept for their products.

Quoting further from Mr. Woll's letter:

Recently the United States Tariff Commission, after 2 years' study, issued their findings pertaining to the pottery industry, and the effect imports of Japanese pottery products have on the employment opportunities and wages of American pottery workers.

The Tariff Commission found that some 30 percent of all pottery and chinaware yearly purchased in the United States is produced in Japan, where the workers receive less than \$4 per week for 60 hours of labor; that, in the production of pottery, at least 50 percent



of the wholesale selling price represents what is paid to the workers; that American workers receive an average of \$18.50 per week of 40 hours, and such wages left an average of less than 7 percent for the owners of the industry over a period of the 5 years studied; that American workers, more than 90 percent organized in the National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, can hardly hope to secure either increased wages or shorter hours as long as the products of Japanese workers control and govern the American market; that while the Japanese manufacturers increased the list price of their products some 50 percent in 1 year, yet they landed their products in the American markets at just below American costs of production of similar goods.

The plight of the American farmers is well typified by the effect which imports of butter far-away New Zealand have in American markets. January 1935, 92-score butter at Chicago was 34.17 cents per pound. Danish butter, in London, the same month was 20.26 cents per pound. New Zealand butter, in London, the same month was 17.77 cents per pound. These quotations, with slight variations, are indicative of the butter situation throughout the entire year of 1935. In New York City 92-score butter, December 1935, was 34 cents per pound. The declared invoice value of foreign butters, the same month, was 18.07 cents per pound. When considering these quotations it must not be forgotten that freight rates from western Europe, New Zealand, or Japan to the New York consuming area, are from one-fifth to one-half the costs of transporting comparable American goods by American railroads to these same coastal cities. The result is that thousands of American railroad workers suffer loss of employment, American industrial workers and American farmers surrender, at least in part, our consuming markets to the more advantageously situated and lower-wage-paying foreign producers.

A study of comparative costs for 1935 of imported foreign products and merchandise with duty and freight paid, as compared with domestic costs of the same articles laid down in the principal consuming markets in this country, from the table prepared by the America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, discloses the following advantages which have been given by the New Deal to foreign farmers and laborers on the sale of their products in the American market: An advantage of \$26 to the Argentine producer on every 100 bushels of imported corn; an advantage of \$8.30 to Polish producers on every 100 bushels of imported rye; an advantage of \$42.80 to Argentina on every 100 bushels of imported flax, as well as \$3.64 on every 100 pounds of imported tallow; an advantage to Czechoslovakia of \$148.10 on every 100 pairs of imported women's shoes; an advantage to Japan of \$2.03 on every gross of imported pottery and earthenware; and an advantage to Uruguay in 1933 of \$1.89 on every 100 pounds of canned meat (figures on meat not available for 1935).

While I have given only a few imports, the disadvantages against American farmers and laborers are found in equal degree as to all imports. Continuation of these conditions eliminates possible employment opportunities for American industrial workers and prevents American farmers from securing fair prices for the products of American farms. These disadvantages can be corrected by increasing duties. The President now has the power to increase or lower duties 50 percent of existing rates. Thus far he has elected to lower duties in the reciprocal-trade agreements to the detriment of farmers and laborers in this country.

#### EXPORTS OF AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

Chester C. Davis, Agricultural Adjustment Administrator, after an extended tour of Europe to find an outlet for American farm products, has just announced:

It is evident we can't hope to dispose of our farm surpluses abroad. The nations I visited are greatly interested in reciprocal-trade agreements. They would like to establish a freer basis of trade, a greater liberalization with this and other countries in the exchange of commodities. Unless farmers unite in this country to solve their common problems through control of production, agriculture will do another tail spin.

If it is true, as Mr. Davis has stated, that we have lost our export market for farm products, then it is more evident than ever before, that the administration should stop the importation of competitive farm products and only permit the entry of those commodities which cannot be produced in this country. Again I state that I am not opposed to the proper kind of control in production; but if we are to have it, then the farmers of America should enjoy the full benefit of

the domestic market without foreign interference. It is not strange that foreigners want freer trade. Why? Because the American market is the best market in the world for agricultural and manufactured products, and nothing would please our foreign friends more than to take this market away from the American people. Control or no control of production, we will do a tail spin unless the new dealers change their policy so as to give adequate protection to the citizens of the United States.

#### INCREASING NATIONAL DEBT, EXPENDITURES, AND UNEMPLOYMENT

It is high time for the American people to take inventory of assets and liabilities. Who will pay \$34,000,000,000 national debt which is estimated will be on our hands by the end of the year? Why, the taxpayers, of course; and the taxpayers are not one class of the people. They are all of the people—rich and poor alike. More than 60 percent of the taxes will be in the form of indirect taxes, which are concealed and paid by all consumers in increased costs of goods and merchandise purchased. It is estimated that the average American family pays an annual indirect tax of \$300. This tax will increase so long as the administration continues to spend \$2 for every dollar of income.

I sincerely believe that public expenditures should be made to take care of those in need and distress during a great national emergency, but I cannot concur in many of the wasteful and political policies practiced by the administration in the present crisis.

With 20,000,000 on relief and more than 12,000,000 unemployed, we have a right to question the administration's relief and work policies. Billions are being spent in thousands of work projects in all parts of the country. In accordance with Presidential order, these projects only provide work for people on the relief rolls. Millions of our citizens who have used up their savings and have lost their homes are being forced to go on relief, believing that they would secure work on some public project, only to find a Presidential order which prohibits their employment unless on relief prior to November 1 of last year.

Is such a policy fair to these unfortunate people? I have repeatedly requested the President and Mr. Hopkins to change this order so that worthy men and women may secure work when work is available. Thus far these officials have refused to recognize the appeal. Instead they have brusquely crushed the hopes of millions who are anxious to get work so as to provide for themselves and their families.

If the Federal Government is to continue the relief program, then wasteful practices and political pressure should be eliminated. The top-heavy and expensive political organization now used in the name of relief, but largely to build up a Nation-wide political machine, should be cast into discard.

The evils of the present Federal relief system could largely be eliminated by having Congress distribute Federal relief funds on a per-capita basis to county and city authorities. Up to 3 years ago these authorities had charge of local relief. They are familiar with local conditions; and if such funds would be turned over to them, they would employ twice as many worthy individuals on necessary local projects as are now employed under the present political system.

#### THE COST OF THE NEW DEAL

In its first 3 years of office the Roosevelt administration has spent more than the first 23 Presidents of the United States in 122 years of office. The comparison is astonishing. The figures are of such size as to be almost beyond ordinary grasp. On March 16, 1936, the total was \$21,252,000,000. The indicated total to June 30, 1937, is \$31,413,000,000; and the taxpayers will be called upon to pay the bill. Yes; it is high time for the American people to take inventory, drastically cut costs of Government, and then chart a course along American lines for the return of equal opportunity and prosperity to all of our citizens.



Table of comparative costs—Advantages foreign products have in American markets  
[Prepared by America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference from Government reports]

Product	Year	Average wholesale selling value	Volume of imports	Principal country of origin	Foreign invoice value	Duty paid	Ocean freight	Domestic freight	Landed cost at New York	Advantage foreign producer over domestic	Advantage domestic producer over foreign
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Corn.....	1933		160,283 bushels; \$76,609.	Argentina...	\$41 per 100 bushels	\$25 per 100 bushels.					
	1935	Chicago, No. 3, Whites, \$84.30 per 100 bushels; Kansas City, No. 3, Yellows, \$83.50 per 100 bushels.	43,237,010 bushels; \$20,288,097.	do.....	\$44 per 100 bushels.	do.....	Argentina to New York, \$7.50 per 100 bushels.	Chicago to New York, \$18.20 per 100 bushels.	From Argentina, \$76.50 per 100 bushels; Chicago, \$102.50 per 100 bushels.	Argentina \$26 per 100 bushels.	
Rye.....	1933		8,005,796 bushels; \$3,874,062.								
	1935	No. 2 at Chicago, \$57.70 per 100 bushels.	9,642,523 bushels; \$4,755,012.	Poland.....	\$45.10 per 100 bushels.	\$15 per 100 bushels.	Poland to New York, \$7.50 per 100 bushels.	Chicago to New York, \$18.20 per 100 bushels.	From Poland, \$67.60 per 100 bushels; Chicago, \$75.90 per 100 bushels.	Poland, \$8.30 per 100 bushels.	
Linseed or flaxseed..	1933		13,825,163 bushels; \$13,486,586.	Argentina...	\$95.50 per 100 bushels.						
	1935	At Minneapolis, \$175.30 per 100 bushels.	17,559,662 bushels; \$15,623,121.	do.....	\$87 per 100 bushels.	\$65 per 100 bushels.	Argentina to New York, \$12.50 per 100 bushels.	Chicago to New York, \$32 per 100 bushels.	From Argentina, \$164.50 per 100 bushels; Chicago, \$207.30 per 100 bushels.	Argentina, \$42.80 per 100 bushels.	
Cottonseed oil (refined).	1933	At New York, Summer Yellow Prime, \$4.50 per 100 pounds.	Nil.								
	1935	At New York, Summer Yellow Prime, \$10.40 per 100 pounds.	166,000,000 pounds; \$8,800,000.	United Kingdom.	\$5.79 per 100 pounds.	\$3 per 100 pounds.	United Kingdom to New York, \$0.27 per 100 pounds.	Galveston to New York, \$0.30 per 100 pounds.	From United Kingdom, \$9.06 per 100 pounds; Galveston, \$10.40 per 100 pounds.	United Kingdom, \$1.34 per 100 pounds.	
Beef tallow.....	1933		233,391 pounds; \$7,204.	Canada.....							
	1935	At Chicago, \$8.60 per 100 pounds.	240,725,454 pounds; \$12,871,109.	Argentina...	\$5.50 per 100 pounds.	\$0.50 per 100 pounds.	Argentina to New York, \$0.31 per 100 pounds.	Chicago to New York, \$0.45 per 100 pounds.	From Argentina, \$6.41 per 100 pounds; Chicago, \$9.05 per 100 pounds.	Argentina, \$3.64 per 100 pounds.	
Creamery butter....	1933		1,021,806 pounds; \$160,626.	New Zealand.							
	1935	New York (firsts) \$28.80 per 100 pounds.	22,674,642 pounds; \$3,576,942.	do.....	\$17 per 100 pounds.	\$14 per 100 pounds.	New Zealand to New York, \$1.30 per 100 pounds.	Minneapolis to New York, \$1.20 per 100 pounds.	From New Zealand, \$32.30 per 100 pounds; Minneapolis, \$28.80 per 100 pounds.	(1).....	
Canned meat.....	1933	Factory wholesale value, \$13.80 per 100 pounds.	43,024,989 pounds; \$2,812,806.	Uruguay....	\$6.20 per 100 pounds.				Uruguay, \$12.50 per 100 pounds; Chicago, \$14.39 per 100 pounds.	Uruguay, \$1.89 per 100 pounds.	
	1935	Not available.....	76,258,346 pounds; \$5,564,536.	do.....	\$7 per 100 pounds.	\$6 per 100 pounds.	Uruguay to New York, \$0.30 per 100 pounds.	Chicago to New York, \$0.49 per 100 pounds.			
Women's shoes.....	1933	Black, McKay, sewed, at Boston, \$218 per 100 pairs.	1,785,449 pairs; \$1,574,181.	Czechoslovakia.	\$78 per 100 pairs.						
	1935	Black, McKay, sewed, at Boston, \$248 per 100 pairs.	1,175,260 pairs; \$930,304.	do.....	\$78.70 per 100 pairs.	\$23.60 per 100 pairs.	Czechoslovakia to New York, \$2.50 per 100 pairs.	Boston to New York, \$4.20 per 100 pairs.	From Czechoslovakia, \$104.10 per 100 pairs; Boston, \$252.20 per 100 pairs.	Czechoslovakia, \$148.10 per 100 pairs.	
Pottery, china, earthenware—decorated and undecorated.	1933	\$9.396 per gross.....							Landed cost minus freight.		
	1934	\$11.088 per gross.....	8,215,860 dozen; \$3,179,614.	Japan.....	\$4.64 per gross.....	\$4.45 per gross.....	Japan to New York, \$0.35 per 100 pounds.	East Liverpool to New York, \$0.50 per 100 pounds.	From Japan, \$9.05 per gross; East Liverpool, \$11.08 per gross.	Japan, \$2.03 per gross.	
Anthracite coal.....	1933	Chestnut \$11.65 per ton.	407,368 tons; \$2,617,323.	Russia (50 percent).	\$6.43 per ton.	None.....	\$1.50 per ton.			Russia, \$3.33 per ton.	
	1935	Chestnut f. o. b. mines \$6.75 per ton.	57,166 tons; \$1,157,828.	do.....	\$7.32 per ton.	None.....	\$1.50 per ton.	Pennsylvania to Boston, \$3.65 per ton.	Import, \$8.82 per ton; Pennsylvania, \$10.40 per ton.	Imports, \$1.58 per ton.	
Crude petroleum....	1933	Kansas to Oklahoma, \$0.567 per barrel.	31,924,327 barrels; \$17,718,108.	Venezuela...	\$0.55 per barrel.						
	1935	Kansas to Oklahoma, \$0.94 per barrel.	25,545,533 barrels; \$18,021,858.	do.....	\$0.667 per barrel.	\$0.21 per barrel.	\$0.23 per barrel.	Oklahoma to New Jersey, \$0.60 per barrel.	From Venezuela, \$1.10 per barrel; Oklahoma, \$1.54 per barrel.	Venezuela, \$0.433 per barrel.	

<sup>1</sup> During first 4 months of year domestic prices averaged 33.7 cents per pound, 92-score, in New York. Landed cost of New Zealand butter averaged 31.7 cents per pound, or 2 cents less than domestic butter. During this period imports amounted to 17,000,000 pounds. Domestic prices fell to 27.3 cents in May and to 23.8 cents in July and imports fell to 3,000,000 pounds from May to December.

<sup>2</sup> Values show apparent falsity of foreign invoices.



Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable from a legislative viewpoint that this matter has come up the way it has, for it rather gives some Members the idea that this is "pork barrel" legislation, which is not true. Every one of these projects can be justified and have been justified before various boards. I do not believe all of us are familiar with the facts as they exist in reference to these projects.

The gentleman who preceded me would leave the idea that we are going to bring a vast amount of new land into production that is not already in production. Another gentleman said he thought every project named here should be justified before we appropriate money for it. I am interested in one project, and I want to take the time I have to explain this project, for I think it is typical of other projects; and if you understand it, you will see that the ideas expressed by many of the Members today are not sound.

The project in my district is the Provo River project. Ten million dollars was allocated for this project out of public-works funds. Engineers from the Public Works Administration, engineers from the Bureau of Reclamation, and the best engineers in the United States approved the project as sound. In this project \$2,000,000 will be used to construct a dike across Utah Lake which will stop evaporation on that lake approximately 25 percent and thereby conserve that much water. Eight million dollars is to be used to construct a dam and build canals. Not 1 acre of new land is involved in this project. In this particular project the very heart of Utah is involved; Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County, with a population of approximately 200,000, is somewhat dependent for its culinary water supply and for irrigation for farms already under cultivation.

The city of Provo, with a population of 16,000, and four or five other communities with population varying from 1,000 to 4,000, are dependent on this project for continuous water. Not only is there involved the irrigation of farms that have been cultivated for 50 years but the culinary water supply of these various communities is likewise involved. During the past 10 or 12 years the West has become drier and drier. Farms that had water available 10 years ago have no water today. People are moving off of farms they and their fathers have occupied for 50 years because they cannot find water and are wholly unable to make a living on their farms. We come to the Government and put the proposition up to the officials here in Washington. Money was allocated to relieve the situation, but now we find the money taken away from us for the sole purpose of feeding the hungry and clothing the naked in other parts of the country than ours through the relief administration authorized by the President.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; I refuse to yield.

We now ask you to restore this to us. The President asks you to restore this to us. What are you going to do, turn down your President, turn down us, or are you going to restore it? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to cover these projects and the amendments as fully as I can in the available time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have the full membership of the House present; therefore I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman insist on his point of no quorum?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, there are a great many projects involved in this authorization. On all seven of the projects that are authorized there is absolutely no limit to the cost.

Let us take the Central Valley project in California, the first item. That project is said by reclamation people to be subject to a cost of \$170,000,000. I have in my hand a document issued by the State engineer of California, and on page 37 it is shown that the project will cost \$683,000,000 before being completed.

What kind of a project is it? It is a tremendous dam 420 feet high, located on the Sacramento River. This dam will store up the water and let it down into the junction of the Sacramento River with the San Joaquin River. Then there are provided five dams on the San Joaquin River with pumping projects to pump the water up from one dam to another out of the Sacramento. Then there is a canal with five more dams and pumping projects to carry the water up to a total height of 186 feet. Then there are provided six more pumping projects and another canal to carry the water up to a total height of 250 feet above the junction of the two rivers. Is it not a ridiculous proposition to spend money for such projects?

Mr. BIERMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BIERMANN. That is one of the projects which we will be obligated to go through with if we vote for this Senate amendment?

Mr. TABER. Yes; and it will involve \$683,000,000.

Mr. BIERMANN. The Budget has not approved of this project?

Mr. TABER. The Budget has approved it. That is the worst part of the matter.

Mr. BIERMANN. Has the House Appropriations Committee approved it?

Mr. TABER. Neither the House nor the Appropriations Committee has ever approved it, and, as a matter of fact, the Members refused to consider it when it was pending before the House committee.

Mr. BIERMANN. May I ask the gentleman another question? Members cannot secure copies of this bill.

Mr. TABER. That is a fact.

Mr. BIERMANN. A good many million dollars are involved in this amendment?

Mr. TABER. In this amendment there is involved anywhere from \$1,100,000,000 to \$1,500,000,000, and no one on earth can tell anything about it.

Mr. BIERMANN. How much is involved in this particular appropriation?

Mr. TABER. Which one? The Central Valley project involves \$683,000,000.

Mr. BIERMANN. The gentleman evidently misunderstood me.

Mr. TABER. There is no limitation here at all. The whole \$683,000,000 may go into that project.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield for any further questions.

Mr. GEARHART. Not even for a complete answer? There is a complete answer to the gentleman's contention in the laws of the State of California.

Mr. TABER. No; there is no answer to it. The gentleman may cover that in his own time. According to the language of this bill, it is an authorization for the whole \$683,000,000. That is what we are up against if we agree to this Senate amendment.

Let us go a little further and take up the Grand Lake-Big Thompson project, which project will call for an ultimate appropriation of \$35,000,000 to \$40,000,000, according to the best available information. This project calls for the construction of a canal 10 or 12 miles long under a mountain 12,000 feet high.

Mr. KRAMER. You cannot go over it.

Mr. TABER. Of course, they cannot go over it. As I stated, this calls for the construction of a canal 10 or 12 miles long to carry water from the western slope of the Rocky Mountains to the eastern slope in order to irrigate 1,000,000 acres of land. They ought to pump the water over the mountain, because that would be in line with some of these other operations that have been indulged in.



Mr. THURSTON. Will they not just move the mountain?

Mr. TABER. Probably.

Then there is the Carlsbad project, which will cost a lot of money, as well as numerous others, including the Casper-Alcova project. The only justification for the latter project is the crowd in Wyoming want this money spent. They recognize it will not be a successful operation. As far as irrigation goes, it will be a failure because the land is poisoned.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Utah stated a little while ago that the public lands had brought into the Treasury \$200,000,000, which is now available for irrigation. Here is an item that will involve from \$1,100,000,000 to \$1,500,000,000, and on top of that there has been allocated out of relief funds practically \$200,000,000 more, making a total of anywhere from \$1,300,000,000 to \$1,700,000,000 for irrigation, which is to be taken out of this \$200,000,000 which the gentleman from Utah stated has been collected from this land.

Mr. Speaker, should we not use some sense? Should we not stop the expenditures for these tremendous items? The Grand Lake-Big Thompson project, to which I previously referred, will probably run \$35,000,000 to \$40,000,000 and has never been properly investigated by even the Bureau of Reclamation. They tell us themselves they would know whether it was a feasible project or a fair project after they have made an investigation and report. Why should we authorize something that the Secretary of the Interior himself says we should not embark on unless he has the discretion to stop it? Is that not ridiculous?

I wish I could go into the detail of all of these things. There is, according to the State engineer of California, ample water to irrigate all the lands in the Upper San Joaquin Valley out of the Friant Reservoir, without going into this tremendous Kennett Reservoir which this matter involves.

Let me say to you that on page 160 of the engineer's report it is said:

Sufficient water could be obtained from these sources (the Friant Reservoir) to meet the needs of the developed areas with a deficient water supply at a cost less than any other source.

This indicates that this whole Kennett Reservoir proposition which is going to cost a tremendous lot of money is not justified unless we want to put a million and a half or two million more acres of land under cultivation.

The Columbia River Basin means a couple of million acres more under cultivation. All of the items mean tremendous additional acreage, and we should not think of going on with this kind of proposition.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. THURSTON. I am sure the House would like to know from the sponsors of this proposition what the ultimate cost will be. Has anyone here this information available?

Mr. TABER. Why, no. There is not anything here to justify any of these projects or to tell what they will cost, and there is nothing to limit their cost, because the language of the bill is wide open without any limitation whatever being placed on any project. This is a most ridiculous thing. If the Naval Affairs Committee were to bring in a bill authorizing battleships, you would not consider it for a moment unless it provided a limit of cost, and each one of these items is big enough to run wild with the Treasury without any limitation whatever.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Has the gentleman any idea how many million acres of newly irrigated land would be put under cultivation if all of these projects were to go through?

Mr. TABER. It could run into 5,000,000 acres of land before they got through with it without any trouble whatever.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield now.

It seems to me we should not at this time go ahead any further with this proposition. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the able gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] would allow his antipathy toward reclamation projects in general and the Central Valley water project in particular to cause him to divert from what are actual facts.

If the gentleman from New York and the Members of the House will refer to page 79 of the supplementary hearings before the conferees having in charge the Interior Department appropriation bill, they will see a complete breakdown of the cost of the Central Valley project with an analysis as of May 1, 1934, submitted by Mr. Page, of the Bureau of Reclamation, which shows a total cost of \$165,989,309. This is quite different from the \$683,000,000 the gentleman referred to.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert this table in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LARRABEE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The table referred to follows:

Summary estimate of cost of Central Valley project of California, analysis of May 1, 1934

Unit	Preliminary expense	Cost of land and rights-of-way	Construction	Engineering charges	Legal, administrative, and other overhead charges	Interest during construction	Total cost
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Kennett Dam and Reservoir	\$225,900	\$2,540,400	\$49,426,900	\$1,807,600	\$2,485,400	\$3,199,748	\$59,685,948
Kennett power plant	52,700		12,114,900	579,400	421,400	1,187,230	14,355,630
Keswick Dam and after-bay	19,200	15,000	1,752,500	61,900	85,100	89,356	2,023,056
Keswick power plant	19,000		4,368,300	208,800	151,900	312,244	5,058,244
Kennett transmission line and terminal substation	51,000	477,200	11,249,600	509,900	458,900	919,463	13,696,063
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta cross channel	15,100	230,000	3,250,100	166,400	121,000	88,151	3,870,751
Contra Costa conduit	9,400	397,000	1,775,000	94,400	85,000	46,586	2,407,386
Friant Dam and Reservoir	63,900	230,000	11,801,300	418,900	575,900	533,124	13,623,124
Madera Canal	12,600	63,200	2,825,400	125,600	113,000	77,509	3,217,309
Friant-Kern Canal	99,100	1,611,100	21,170,900	990,500	891,500	1,004,602	25,787,702
San Joaquin pumping system	55,400	558,900	12,172,100	553,500	498,200	475,996	14,314,096
Water rights and general expense							8,000,000
Total	623,300	6,122,800	131,905,000	5,516,900	5,887,300	7,934,009	165,989,309

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$12,000,000 to be contributed by Federal Government in interest of navigation and flood control.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] made the statement that the State engineer of California had stated that there is an abundant water supply at hand for the upper San Joaquin Valley. I have in my hand a letter from the State engineer, Mr. Edward

M. Hyatt, in which he states, referring to a protest that has been circulated rather widely among Members of the House here, that this statement that abundant water supplies exist near at hand for the upper San Joaquin Valley is absolutely contrary to the facts.



Abundant proof exists as to the serious water shortage which exists in the upper San Joaquin Valley and which has already caused the abandonment of over 20,000 acres of highly valuable farms planted to oranges, nuts, figs, and numerous other specialty crops that by the greatest stretch of the imagination cannot and do not compete with the corn of Iowa or with any eastern agricultural products.

Engineering studies extending over 10 years, which have been carefully checked by Federal authorities, show conclusively that locally available water supplies are deficient to take care of the requirements on an area of over 400,000 acres of highly valuable land in the upper San Joaquin Valley, and there is no possibility of obtaining additional supplies from local or nearby sources.

The investigations further show that unless some outside water can be brought in, and the only source is from the Sacramento Valley watershed, these lands must go back to desert conditions involving a probable loss of \$40,000,000 in annual crop production and over \$100,000,000 in capital investment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I am sorry, I cannot yield.

There is no question about the fact that this water must come from the other end of California for it is there that the rainfall occurs in abundance. It is there we can store this water supply.

It is true that by building the Friant Dam, sufficient water can be obtained to supply the water needs of the upper San Joaquin Valley, but in doing so you drain and denude the San Joaquin River itself, and it is necessary to replenish that with the water from the Sacramento. That is the reason for pumping the water from the Sacramento up the San Joaquin. These San Joaquin riparian owners and irrigations are entitled to consideration as well.

My time does not permit me to cover the needs of the delta region in my own district to remove salinity conditions caused by deficient water flow in summer months; nor the industrial water problem along Suisun Bay. Suffice it to say that all these conditions have caused every public body that has investigated this project, including the Board of Army Engineers, to approve it as feasible from an engineering standpoint and as economically practicable. Remember that \$12,000,000 of the cost of this project has already been authorized in the river and harbor bill of last session.

Gentlemen, remember, too, that this cost is repayable to the Government and that all that we are asking for is authorization to proceed under the reclamation law on a project designed to save, and not increase, productive acreage.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Speaker, in 1902 the Federal Government embarked on a policy of reclamation. In spite of all ill experiences in the history of reclamation, today I think there is not a forward-looking, progressive man in the United States who would care to undo, as a whole, what has been done. As a policy, reclamation has been a success.

About 2 years ago the administration appointed Mr. F. E. Schmitt, editor of the Engineering News Record, and John W. Haw, director of agricultural development of the Northern Pacific Railway, as a committee to investigate the reclamation problem. They visited and held public hearings at nearly all of the Federal reclamation projects. After an exhaustive investigation of the subject they reached the conclusion, among other things, that reclamation "has shown by its results to be a sound and desirable national undertaking which represents a constructive policy of social development."

They further found that reclamation "has little relation to the problem of surplus agricultural production." That seems to be the judgment of nearly all who have made a thorough practical study of the agricultural problem.

From the west side of the Mississippi Valley to the Pacific Coast States it has been the irrigated sections that have formed the basis for the development of the economic, social,

educational, and political advancement of those great areas. Reclaimed lands have been the bridges conveniently and happily connecting the East and the West.

The reclamation service works with over 30 years of practical experience behind it. It has built over 100 dams, none of which have failed. It is the greatest dam-building organization in the world. Its investigations are thorough; its estimates are reliable.

The projects we seek to approve have been investigated by this service. Each of these projects has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. Each one of these projects has been allotted funds by the President. Construction work has begun on nearly all of them. Now it is proposed that we repudiate what has been done; that the plans under way, the work that is progressing, shall be disrupted; that the hopes and faith of the communities affected, built upon their just expectations, shall be turned into disappointment if not deception. As to a number of these projects, Congress gave the President power to approve them and allot funds for their construction. Is Congress now in position to repudiate the exercise of the power it granted the President and turn away without responsibility from the communities adversely affected?

Let us not look at reclamation as a charity, but rather judge it from a business standpoint.

Take the Salt River project. They had canals there without any reservoir. The Government spent \$11,500,000; reservoirs were built. A short time later an area that had been a desert-blown waste was the home of men who in the war period bought \$15,000,000 in Liberty bonds. In 1 year they paid over 10 percent of the cost of the project to the Federal Government as internal-revenue taxes.

In 1 year recently 95,000 carloads of manufactured goods, machinery, automobiles, and other products were delivered to our reclamation projects. They afforded a market to all sections of the country.

For every dollar received by the farmers on these reclamation projects for their products, industry, labor, and transportation in the United States received \$2.

Take Boulder Dam, built at a vast expense. It is now estimated that it will produce \$162,000,000 surplus within 50 years, the period allowed for repayment of its costs. When that project was debated on this floor we had predictions that Boulder Dam would be a waste of money by the Federal Government. Instead of a waste its present assured income indicates a profit of \$162,000,000 at the end of the 50-year period. [Applause.]

The Kennett Dam proposed for the Central Valley project of California is a wonderful site for a reservoir and power plant. It will produce 350,000 horsepower with more water than the dam will store. It would be supplemented by the Keswick Dam a few miles further down the stream with its 65,000 horsepower.

The impounded water will produce power in great quantities; it will provide better transportation in the Sacramento River channel throughout the low-water season; it will afford a water level that will serve as a natural barrier to hold back the salt water from the San Francisco Bay that in recent years has been threatening the destruction of about 400,000 acres of rich farming land in the delta of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. These lands are largely below sea level at high tide, protected by levees, but dependent on fresh water for irrigation and domestic use.

The stabilized controlled flow made possible by these dams will give practical control over floods in the Sacramento Valley. At high flood only about 20 percent of the volume of the Sacramento River flows in its banks and with extreme floods the river is a peril as well as a source of much damage to the people of wide areas in the valley.

These waters as "liquid gold" will be carried on for domestic, industrial, and agricultural purposes. They will supply or release other water for saving large farming areas where a diminishing water supply from other sources have caused the abandonment, and places where abandonment is now threatened.



The Central Valley is a great expensive project; not without its difficult problems, it is true. Nevertheless, I dare say there is no other water project in the United States where the plan will serve so many useful purposes and in such an important way. In a word, it will provide a vast storage of water, a large power production, a material aid to navigation in a river channel for a great distance, flood control of great proportions, a domestic and industrial water supply, and water for irrigation to save lands that otherwise perhaps cannot be saved. It will supply water where 20,000 pumps aided a dry series of years in lowering the water table hopelessly while orchards and crops disappeared.

Under the terms of the adoption of this project as proposed in this bill, the income from the power and water services seem to assure a return on the investment to the Government. When the cost of the project is entirely repaid, the reservoir and power plant will remain the property of the United States, to afford an income to the Government and serve as an integral part of the economic life of the country and to the betterment of our people. It will serve their useful purposes long after the last dollar of cost shall have been returned to the Government.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the Central Valley project is urgently necessary to the immediate and future welfare of the State of California. It will store, control, and distribute the waters of the two great rivers of California, the Sacramento and San Joaquin, and is designed to meet the present and immediate future water problems of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys and of the upper San Francisco Bay region.

The major objectives of the project are to furnish a necessary supplemental water supply to 1,000,000 acres of highly improved irrigated lands in the southern San Joaquin Valley, fully equipped with modern private pumping plants or surface distribution systems, valued at about \$200,000,000 exclusive of cities, towns, and general civilization all dependent on water, of this 40,000 acres have already been abandoned due to lack of water; to prevent the invasion of salt water into the delta of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and thus remove the menace of rendering sterile 400,000 acres of rich cultivated land, which produces crops annually valued at about \$25,000,000, and has a valuation of \$100,000,000, and on which there has been expended by local interests \$27,000,000 in reclamation and flood-protection works; to furnish a greatly needed and necessary fresh-water supply to heavy industry, municipalities, and irrigated lands in Contra Costa County on Suisun Bay, industries having a capital investment of \$43,000,000, an annual pay roll of \$13,000,000, and an annual production of \$120,000,000; to make the Sacramento River navigable from its mouth 250 miles to Red Bluff; to provide flood protection to 1,000,000 acres of improved land in the Sacramento Valley; to furnish necessary additional water supplies to a large acreage of irrigated lands along the Sacramento River; to furnish electric power at rates substantially lower than those now prevailing in northern California.

The Central Valley project will not bring into production any new lands but will immediately retire from production 240,000 acres of submarginal irrigated lands, from which water rights are to be purchased for use on highly specialized crops in southern San Joaquin Valley now facing abandonment on account of water shortage. The project estimate includes cost of retiring these submarginal lands from irrigation. More than one and one-half million acres of developed land in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys and in Contra Costa County will be served and benefited by the project. Crops raised on these lands are largely specialized and noncompetitive with the rest of the Nation.

The Central Valley of California, composed of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, lies between the Sierra Nevada Mountains on the east and the Coast Range on the west. The northern portion of the valley, known as the Sacramento Valley, is drained by the Sacramento River, which rises in the Sierra Nevada Mountains near the northern boundary of the State and flows 400 miles in a southerly direction to its mouth, at the eastern end of Suisun Bay, an

arm of San Francisco Bay. The southern portion of the Central Valley, and known as the San Joaquin Valley, is drained by the San Joaquin River, which rises in the central portion of California and flows northwesterly 350 miles to Suisun Bay, where it enters just south of the mouth of the Sacramento River. The floor of the Central Valley is a flat, alluvial plane 500 miles long and 30 to 60 miles wide. It contains about one-half of the agricultural land of the State. Three million acres of the valley are under irrigation, being two-thirds of the total irrigated land of California.

The population within the confines of the Central Valley is nearly 1,000,000. Its normal value of farm products is about \$310,000,000; manufactured products, \$265,000,000; and mineral production, including gas and oil, \$73,000,000.

The Central Valley project, directly and indirectly, affects two-thirds of the 6,000,000 people of the State of California. The assessed valuation of the area to be served by the Central Valley project aggregates \$1,339,000,000. This was for the year 1935 on an assessment basis of 40 percent of actual value.

The Central Valley of California is semiarid and the amount of water that is available or can be conserved limits, controls, and determines all human activity.

The method of farming in the Central Valley of California is different than in the Middle Western and Eastern States, due to the fact that it does not rain from April to November. Crops cannot live through this 7 months' dry season without water. Irrigation from April to September is absolutely necessary and the whole agricultural structure of the State is built upon the distribution and conservation of water. Water is the valuable thing and not the land.

Practically all of the water for irrigation development in the State has been made available through private initiative and effort. California, as you know, started as a mining State and gradually developed its agriculture. For the first 20 or 30 years water was available from nearby streams and could be diverted for irrigation purposes. Since 1900 dams have been constructed to store water for irrigation of lands many miles away. In addition to the storage of surface water behind dams, a large number of wells were developed in the Central Valley to supply by pumping underground water for irrigation. There are some 20,000 pumping wells in the San Joaquin Valley, which is the southern portion of the Central Valley of California. It was presumed that the underground water was inexhaustible, but that was a most serious mistake. The underground water at a profitable depth is gone. It cannot be replenished only at a very small amount per year, even if all pumping should stop. Most of the streams available to the Central Valley for irrigation developments are in use, and underground sources have failed.

A serious and critical water shortage exists in the Central Valley, supporting a high type of agriculture and development. Lands, homes, and towns have been and are now being abandoned because of lack of water. More than a million acres are affected, and unless remedial action is taken wholesale abandonment will follow, with a property-value loss of over \$100,000,000 and 50,000 people will be forced to leave their farms and homes.

The Central Valley project calls for the construction of a great dam 420 feet high at Kennett, on the Sacramento River near Redding; a conduit from the delta region to Martinez to furnish water to industries; a huge dam at Friant near Fresno, with canals leading north to Chowchilla River and south to Bakersfield; and a 200-mile transmission line from Kennett to Antioch.

The project has been determined upon after long years of investigations by the State of California, by the United States Bureau of Reclamation, by the United States War Department, and other Federal departments. The hearing on this project before the subcommittee for the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1937 on March 26, 1936, definitely show, on page 79, that the project will cost \$165,989,000.

The State of California has expended over \$2,000,000 in helping to outline this project, and along with the Government department investigations, it has been demonstrated that the project as presented is the only economic solution



for the relief of the populations of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, in view of the short time that has been allotted to me, may I have the privilege of revising and extending my remarks in the RECORD at this point?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, several of the Members who have risen to speak against the various projects included in the amendments sent to us by the Senate, have based their opposition almost entirely upon the idea that reclamation is something that is wrong, something that should be avoided, something that should be abhorred. The Central Valley water project of California is in part a reclamation project, but it is more than that. It includes many other things. Its construction would greatly improve navigation upon the Sacramento River. It will improve it so much that navigation will be extended up that river more than 100 miles above the point beyond which ships are today able to ply. It will control the salt condition which is encroaching upon the great delta of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and will save for productive use thousands of acres now threatened with encrustation. Contrary to the fears so frequently expressed today the development of this great enterprise will not bring lands into cultivation that are not in production today. On the contrary, it will save from abandonment some 500,000 acres of land that are today planted and in a high productive condition, every acre of which will go back to the condition of the desert unless water is brought to those parching lands within the next very few years. Also, this great California project will make possible the development a tremendous wattage of electricity, cheap power, power that will become a tremendous boon to the industries that are centered in the San Francisco Bay area. Are not these great benefits sufficiently important to merit even the votes of those who despise the very thought of reclamation? Could Government money be loaned more profitably in the interest of the general welfare of our common country?

In the opinion of those who are familiar with the details of Central Valley no project we have ever considered offers greater return on the dollar's investment, nor promises more in comfort and happiness to the people it is our honor to represent.

As I said before, it has been argued by those who are opposed to the authorization by this Congress of additional reclamation projects that the development of further projects of this character will bring into cultivation and production vast acreage—acreage that will be thrown into competition with lands which are already producing in agricultural products far more than the consuming public can absorb. In other words, it is contended that the preparation of new lands for agricultural exploitation is in direct opposition to the theory of crop reduction which has guided governmental activities since the inauguration of the present administration.

The advancement of this argument loses sight entirely of the fact that years will pass long before any of these projects are finally completed and before the lands adjacent thereto will be supplied with the water so indispensable to their successful utilization. The population of this country will not reach its greatest heights for many years to come. The whole reclamation scheme is one which has set its sights with a view to the providing of homes and the encouragement of increasing production for those that will be the citizens of tomorrow, for our remotest posterity. If this generation should fail to have a regard for the citizen of responsibility of tomorrow, who, in their turn, must assume the burden of carrying on the work of the world, when the citizens of today will be compelled to yield up to younger

and more vigorous hands the responsibilities of the hour, it would indeed be recalcitrant to duty. The blessings that have flown from the projects of the character we have under investigation today surpasses measurement, and the benefits that are to accrue from the development of projects similar to those which are included in the bill which we are now considering defy imagination. To eliminate the Senate amendment from the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act would be, insofar as the future is concerned, a tragedy of stupendous proportions.

Despite whatever may be said in reference to the reclamation projects as a group, it cannot be said of the great Central Valley project of California that this is one which will bring into cultivation new acreage within the span of the present emergency, the economic depression, which is now so rapidly fading in the brightening light of returning prosperity.

Insofar as the necessities of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valleys of California are concerned, the great Central Valley project is a water-conservation measure. Five hundred thousand acres of land now developed to the highest state of productivity, because of failing water conditions, will revert to the conditions of the desert unless new sources of water supply are made available within the next few years. The Central Valley water project promises relief from this condition of creeping paralysis which threatens the lives and the homes of thousands upon thousands of our citizens, who have given a half century of their best effort and unwavering devotion to the development of this territory, farm homes where living conditions have been blessed with nature's generous abundance. The necessity of bringing early relief to this vast territory is so urgent that the approval and the early beginning of construction has long ago taken on the characteristic of an emergency. So it is to save and conserve land already in a high state of production, not to bring new lands into production, that has afforded the initiative urge to the people of the State of California to make this appeal to the people who dwell elsewhere than within the friendly territory of this great western Commonwealth.

In the brief time that has been allotted to me it is quite impossible to go into a technical and detailed description of the variable phases and engineering scheme of this great interior California project. Suffice it to say that in the northern portion of the great interior valley of California there is a tremendous abundance of water, an abundance far beyond the needs of the territory in which the water has its source, and by tragic contrast there is an increasing scarcity of water in the southern end of this great inland territory. The Central Valley water project is an integrated one, a project with many units, all of which make up the perfect whole. The general scheme of things contemplates a vast system for trading water, the diversion of water from northern sources for use in neighborhoods farther south. Through this comprehensive system of water trading the excess waters of the Sacramento Valley, the waters for which they have no use, will be brought with all of their God-given blessings to relieve the parched condition of the lower San Joaquin.

As I pointed out a moment ago, the arrival of the northern waters on the southern lands will save from abandonment not less than a half million acres now under cultivation, already in production, and will make possible for thousands upon thousands of people now residing in this cultivated area to remain in their homes, to conserve and improve the great wealth that they have created and developed during the last two generations. If this water does not reach them within the next few years, this bountiful territory of today will become a desert waste of tomorrow. The trees and vines will die for want of water. These farms, the homes of so many happy people, will because of the unrelenting advance of water scarcity, be abandoned to an encroaching desert.

And as to feasibility. Never in the history of reclamation or of irrigation engineering has a project been more carefully studied than has this plan for the water conservation of central California. No person whose opinions are worthy of consideration has pronounced the scheme of it unworkable. It has been reviewed by the War Department Engineers, the



Department of Agriculture, the Reclamation Bureau, the Federal Power Commission, the Public Works Administration, the Federal land bank, the President's waterflow committee, the Natural Resource Board, by the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and by the House of Representatives Committees on Rivers and Harbors, Flood Control, and Appropriations, and by a joint commission appointed by the President of the United States and the Governor of the State of California. All of these national investigating bodies have endorsed the pressing need of a solution of the water problems of the Central Valley, and each of these agencies, through their responsible heads, have endorsed the project in the highest terms.

Characteristic of the commendatory reports on the feasibility and practicality of the engineering phases of the project permit me to quote from the report made by the incumbent Secretary of the Interior to the President of the United States:

I find that the project is feasible from engineering, agricultural, and financial standpoints; that it is adaptable for settlement and farm homes; and that the estimated construction cost is adequate and that the anticipated revenues will be sufficient to return the cost to the United States.

The Commissioner of Reclamation has approved and recommended the construction of the project. I therefore recommend the approval of the Central Valley development as a Federal reclamation project.

The approaching end of the time which has been made available to me through the graciousness of the leadership of the House compels me to bring these remarks of mine to a close. The wonders of this great engineering project, the great blessings that will flow from its completion are so numerous that it will be quite impossible to recount them here now. From the translation of this great Central Valley idea into accomplished fact will flow benefits that will surpass human appraisal. The withholding by the Congress of the aid which a despairing people beseech of you will indeed tear at the heartstrings of a nation. By all means let this construction work, already initiated by virtue of the Executive approval of the President of the United States, go on to completion. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, irrigation water is the very life of the arid West. The United States is billions of dollars wealthier by reason of the fact that this Congress in past years has been liberal enough to allow the West to use a part of the dollars that have been collected by the United States Government from their timber and other resources.

When the Western States came into the Union the Government kept a large part of our territory. Half of Oregon is owned by the United States. Up to within recent years all of the money that went into irrigation came out of this contribution from the resources of the West. Our money it was, simply loaned. It has been returned in millions. It will nearly all be returned.

There are two items in these amendments, one for \$400,000 for the Owyhee—that is, to build canals so that they will not have to pay a terrifically high rate for electricity for pumping. That is all. Who would deny the right to use that much money for that purpose?

Then these other projects will not be completed in a day. It will take a half a generation or more to build the central California project. Likewise, the Grand Coulee. The Owyhee project was started 10 years ago. There is a reservoir 60 miles long with a concrete dam 500 feet high. Why should they continue to pay high rates for electricity to pump water from the Snake River when there is ample water reservoid in a Government reservoir that can be obtained by gravity? The Deschutes project, for which this bill provides \$450,000, has already been authorized. It is one of the most feasible irrigation projects in the United States. It is now settled by people of the highest type, who went there to raise wheat and

will be forced out unless the land can be saved for general farming through irrigation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present. There are not 50 Members on the floor to hear these speeches.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LARRABEE). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 105]

Adair	Crowther	Hoeppe	Oliver
Andrew, Mass.	Dear	Hook	O'Malley
Andrews, N. Y.	Dempsey	Hope	O'Neal
Barden	DeRouen	Kee	Palmisano
Beam	Dietrich	Keller	Parks
Binderup	Dingell	Kelly	Patton
Bland	Dirksen	Kennedy, Md.	Perkins
Boiton	Dorsey	Kerr	Peterson, Fla.
Brennan	Doutrich	Kinzer	Powers
Brooks	Duffey, Ohio	Kopplemann	Quinn
Brown, Mich.	Dunn, Miss.	Lee, Okla.	Rabaut
Buckler, Minn.	Eagle	Lehibach	Sadowski
Buckley, N. Y.	Eaton	Lesinski	Sanders, La.
Bulwinkle	Fenerty	Lord	Schaefer
Burch	Ferguson	Lundeen	Sears
Caldwell	Fish	McGroarty	Seger
Cannon, Wis.	Gambrill	McKeough	Stack
Carmichael	Gasque	McLean	Starnes
Cary	Gifford	McSwain	Steagall
Casey	Goldsborough	Maloney	Stewart
Cavicchia	Goodwin	Millard	Utterback
Chandler	Green	Mitchell, Tenn.	Wadsworth
Chapman	Guyer	Montet	Weaver
Claiborne	Gwynne	Moran	Werner
Clark, N. C.	Hamlin	Moritz	West
Connery	Hancock, N. C.	Nelson	Wilcox
Creal	Hartley	Norton	Zioncheck

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and eighteen Members are present, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. SCRUGHAM, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not want any Member of this House to conclude that I am not at the present time for reclamation, because I am, always have been, and always expect to be. I believe it is the duty of the people to make our natural resources serve the necessities of our advancing civilization, but I believe in proceeding in reclamation projects in a businesslike manner; I believe in having hearings and analyzing every project of any great moment so that we shall be sure the project is feasible and that failure will not result in money and effort being lost. Furthermore, if we are to start on a general policy of conservation throughout the Union, I believe in equal opportunities and equal grants, if you want to call it that, or equal advantages, for every section in conserving its natural resources, and not have just one section picked out and favored. [Applause.]

This brings up my first suggestion. I am not going to have time to cover it—I wish I did. In 1902 we passed a reclamation act and established a reclamation fund into which was paid part of the money realized from the sale of public lands, part of the receipts from mineral leases, and Federal power licenses, and sums repaid as construction charges. This revolving fund has had receipts of about \$245,000,000. It is increasing every year by receipts from these sources at the rate of four or five million dollars. When we first undertook the construction of reclamation projects out of this fund no interest was charged on deferred construction payments, and none is charged now. In the beginning, 10 years was the period in which construction charges were to be repaid. Later that was extended to



20 years, and now it is 40 years without interest. I am perfectly willing that it be so. I am perfectly willing that the proceeds from the sale of land, timber, and minerals in the Western States be used to upbuild that section; but never until this good hour has Congress authorized appropriations from the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury and the spending of money for reclamation projects without interest.

The action we take on this matter today will determine whether or not we shall lend money out of the Treasury for 40 years without interest to reclamation projects of the West when they have the oil royalties and money from other sources going into that special fund.

What is happening? Bear in mind that this is an appropriation bill and was an appropriation bill as it left the House, wherein your Appropriations Committee had proceeded under the Budget system as established by Congress, responding only to authorizations made by law justifying the Appropriations Committee in recommending appropriations. It went to the Senate. How has it come back to the House? It has come back to the House not an appropriation bill but a legislative authorization bill. If we permit this sort of procedure on the part of the Senate, we might just as well abolish some of our legislative committees because the Senate will continue to put their pet legislative provisions on appropriation bills where they know they will receive favorable action because they know an appropriation bill is going to pass.

Look at the bill. Here is more than a page devoted to project after project starting with the language: "The following projects are hereby authorized", strictly legislation.

Here we have the Gila project; never authorized specifically. They claim it was authorized in the act providing for the Boulder Canyon project. When that act passed Congress no Member had any idea of, or had not even thought of, the Gila project. The Gila project was at first condemned by the Secretary of Agriculture as unsuitable for irrigation. It was sent to a board. The board investigated and reported that if sufficient water was run on the land for 8 or 10 years, if it was heavily manured and planted to legumes and built up it might then be irrigated with some hope of growing crops. Notwithstanding this, they want to spend \$20,000,000 on this project. I have not time to go into all the projects.

Let us consider for a moment the Central Valley project in California. For this project \$16,000,000 is carried in the bill, and the estimated cost is \$170,000,000. This project is not on public land but is on private lands. They are going to develop these lands of private individuals without interest. The legislature passed an act creating a district similar to the Tennessee Valley, but a State district, to have absolute control over this project. Let us continue. I am taking only unauthorized projects.

The Carlsbad project in New Mexico is allotted \$900,000 in this bill, but will require \$2,500,000 to complete. This is unauthorized by any law.

There is the Deschutes project, Oregon, \$450,000, in this bill, and \$6,000,000 as the total cost of the project.

There is the Yakima project, \$2,500,000 in this bill, and it will cost a total of \$14,000,000 to construct it, and it has not been authorized.

There is the Casper-Alcova project and other projects.

All of these projects would involve a total appropriation of \$700,000,000 or more to complete them. That is the total estimated cost of these projects.

I have not mentioned a project my distinguished friend the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL] will speak on. That is the Columbia River project or the Grand Coulee project. Let me tell you something about that project. That has been clamored for in Congress for years and years, but the Congress never did recommend or approve it. It has now been approved by the Public Works Administration, which has allowed \$60,000,000 to complete what we call a low dam, 177 feet high. This dam can be completed for \$60,000,000.

They received \$35,000,000 and the other \$35,000,000 was taken away, so that additional money will have to be appropriated in order to complete the dam up to 177 feet.

Since the hearings have been concluded, the plans with reference to that project have been changed and the height of the dam has been increased from 177 feet to over 500 feet and the cost to construct the dam increased to \$118,000,000. Congress last session, in section 2 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of last session, ratified the contracts made for this project and authorized the making of further supplemental contracts.

Mr. Speaker, the longer I live and the more experience I get brings me more firmly to the conclusion that we can never have an economical government with two or three appropriating bodies within that government. [Applause.]

Let me pay my further respects to this Columbia River project, on which it will cost \$118,000,000 to construct one dam. This project will ultimately cost a total of \$389,000,000 to complete. How are they going to get the money back? Why, they are going to lift that water 300 feet up to the mesa of the Columbia River Basin. In my country in west Texas, when we irrigate, we do not attempt to pump water over 40 feet because it will not pay. The cost is too great. It is not economical. Yet they claim by this magnificent cheap power they can lift water 300 feet to irrigate land to plant crops and make a go of it.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Has the gentleman a Columbia River in Texas?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; we have not a Columbia River in Texas, and I am glad we have not; however, we have the Brazos River and the Colorado River, and they go on a rampage and overflow every 3 or 4 years. I am for controlling the overflow of those rivers and also the overflow of the Columbia River as well.

In connection with the hearing on this matter, the head of the Bureau of Reclamation was asked how much horsepower the low dam would develop out there. He answered, "Four hundred and fifty thousand horsepower." He was asked, "How much will your high dam develop?" He answered, "One and one-half million horsepower." He was asked, "Have you a market for the electric current which will be developed through this low dam of 450,000 horsepower?" He said, "No; we have not got the market now." He was asked, "Who are you going to sell it to?" He said:

We are going to lift the water 300 feet. We are going to irrigate the Columbia River basin. Then we are going to bring settlers in there and turn the land over to them either by sale, lease, or otherwise. We will settle that basin, and those farmers will create new cities and towns, and these cities and towns will be the market for our power.

Let me state one other fact. It is as inevitable as the rising and setting of the sun. You cannot push progress beyond the demands of the people who are progressing. [Applause.] When the time comes for the development of the Columbia River basin, when the demand comes for the power, and when the farmers and the people come forth and demand this power, then your Columbia River basin will be developed, and I hope it will bloom and blossom into a rose; but we are not ready for that now.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Let me remind the gentleman that we have great industrial districts on the Pacific coast which are potential markets for that power.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The Pacific coast already has irrigation projects for which there is requested in this bill the sum of \$107,000,000.

Mr. WHITE. But I am dealing with the Columbia River Basin now.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill left the House as an appropriation bill and came back a legislative authorization bill. The bill left the House complying with our Budget



system and came back from the Senate in such shape that the Budget system has been absolutely ignored.

Let me tell you what the Senate did. I do not know why they did all this. Some Members of the Senate, perhaps, had pet projects they wanted to take care of and they wanted to take care of them within the Budget, of course. Then, what did they do? They took the estimates of the Budget and then took \$2,000,000 off this estimate, \$2,000,000 off another estimate, \$1,000,000 off another estimate, and so on, until they got six or eight million dollars. Then they took that money and went out to find new projects that had never been submitted to the Budget and on which no Budget estimate had been made. They divided this money among those projects. A little under \$4,000,000 was divided in that way. They then put the obligation on us to take care of these projects ultimately at a cost of from \$26,900,000 to \$50,000,000.

We might just as well abolish the Budget if we are to approve of procedure like this.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much did the Senate add to the bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. In actual appropriations sixty-one million-and-some-odd dollars over and above the House bill.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. HARLAN. In addition to the \$61,000,000, the undertakings that are authorized in this bill would add how much?

Mr. BUCHANAN. According to the estimates they would create obligations of \$740,000,000 to complete the projects.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want the Members of the House to understand that sending this bill back to conference does not mean, and must not mean, a blow to the progress of reclamation. As I have said, I am for it, and I want it to go forward, but I want it to go forward in a sensible, sane, and business-like way.

If California wants the Central Valley project, let them bring the proposition before the regular committee of the House or the Senate and let it be thoroughly investigated and reported to the House and passed as a legislative proposition.

If the Columbia River Basin wants another project, let the Budget estimate come up and let it be examined thoroughly by the Appropriations Committee or the legislative committee and approved or disapproved according to the facts.

Now, let me tell you something further about this. How did the Senate get these estimates? The President sent his public-works estimates to the House. They were transmitted by the Speaker to my committee, and when I got these public-works projects I called Mr. TAYLOR, the chairman of the subcommittee on the Interior Department bill, into my office and said, "Here are these projects; do you want them?" Mr. TAYLOR said he would consider it. The next I heard was that an agreement had been reached between Mr. TAYLOR and Dr. Mead, the Chief of the Reclamation Bureau at that time, that these estimates would go to the deficiency subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, where Mr. TAYLOR is the member next in rank to me, and we would go into them thoroughly and we would allow the ones that were worthy and reject the ones that were unworthy; we would allow the ones that would not be too great a burden on the Government during this period and reject the ones that would be too much of a burden at this time. The Senate committee was bound to know all about this, and what did they do? Why, they summoned Secretary Ickes before them and they said, "Mr. Secretary, I see where the House has put a Boulder Canyon appropriation and an all-American canal appropriation in their bill, and since the House has done this, is there any reason why we should not put in all of these other items?" The Secretary said there was no reason, but the Secretary was not told that the Boulder Canyon appropriation and the all-American canal appropriation had been carried year after year in the Interior Department appropriation bill as one of the regular items of appropria-

tion, authorized by law, and did not belong with the estimates for emergency appropriations.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am going back to the matter of interest. This is the time to decide whether or not we are going to advance to reclamation projects in the West out of the Treasury general fund money on 40 years' time without interest. Mr. Speaker, if this is to be our policy, then, in the name of justice, in the name of equality, in the name of fair dealing between citizens of every section of this country, let us extend it throughout the entire United States. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL].

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there has been a great deal of misinformation about these amendments. The subject matter in these two amendments, numbered 53 and 54, should have been in the Interior appropriation bill in the House. That is where it belongs. But we Members of the West had no voice in the matter of its not being in there. My understanding was at the time that they were not considered by the Appropriations Committee on the Department of the Interior bill because Dr. Mead, the Commissioner of Reclamation, was ill and unable to appear before the committee. But it was thought that if the matter were permitted to go over to the time of the consideration of the second deficiency bill that Dr. Mead would be able to be present and testify in justification of these projects. That was the reason given me why it was not considered by the Appropriations Committee of the House when it had the Interior appropriation bill before it.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. No; I cannot yield. We are not responsible for the position in which we find ourselves with reference to these Senate amendments. These projects have come back here in Senate amendments on the Interior appropriation bill, the bill in which they should have been incorporated by the House committee.

It would have been entirely satisfactory to have had the matter considered by the House committee on the deficiency bill, but again we had no voice in it. We are not responsible for the condition in which it is today. It certainly belongs in the Interior appropriation bill and it is there now and we are meeting it as best we can.

Something was said by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] to the effect that there were no hearings on the bill. The gentleman is mistaken. There were hearings. I attended and testified at the hearings and many Members of the House attended those hearings. I saw the gentleman from Texas sitting in with the committee when these amendments were brought back from the Senate incorporated in the bill.

There were extensive hearings on these Senate amendments which have been available to every Member of the House. I have a copy now in my hand. It is this booklet which contains the hearings on the two Senate amendments by the House subcommittee handling the Interior appropriation bill.

Now, in the short time I have, I want to tell you something about the projects in a cursory way because my time is limited.

It is true that under amendment 53 certain projects are to be authorized and under Senate amendment 54 these projects are included with others that have been specifically authorized by Congress.

I want to make it plain, too, that every one of the projects in Senate amendments 53 and 54 had the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, except the Grand Lake project in Colorado.

Here is a brief statement of the record as to the institution of these various projects:

The Gila project, Arizona, was authorized in the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1923.

The Salt River project, Arizona, was authorized under the general provisions of the reclamation law in the act of June 17, 1902, and supplemental acts.

The Central Valley project, California, was authorized in section 1 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of April 8, 1935.

Construction was authorized by the President's allocation under section 1 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of April 8, 1935. Investigations also were carried on with reclamation funds.

Owyhee project, Oregon, authorized under general provision of reclamation law, act of June 17, 1902, and supplemental acts.

Grand Coulee Dam project, Washington, under act of August 30, 1935. I will have something further to say on that a little later. This authorization was under section 2 of the act of August 30, 1935.

Columbia Basin project, Washington; economic surveys and investigations; surveys authorized by President's allocation under section 1 of Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of April 8, 1935.

Yakima project, Washington (Roza division), authorized under the general provisions of the reclamation law, act of June 17, 1902.

Provo River project, Utah; construction authorized by allotment made under sections 201 and 202 of National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933; continued under President's allocation under section 1 of Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of April 8, 1935. Investigated with reclamation funds.

Casper-Alcova project, Wyoming; construction authorized by allotment made under National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933; continued under President's allocation from Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of April 8, 1935.

Riverton project, Wyoming; under the general provisions of the Reclamation Act.

Shoshone project, Wyoming; under the general provisions of the reclamation law.

Grand Lake-Big Thompson transmountain diversion, Colorado, as I understand, has no authorization; surveys authorized by allotment made under National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933.

Those are the sources of authority for the beginning of these projects. Work has begun on all of them, with the possible exception of one or two, and they are a part of the President's public-works program.

Now, what is going to be the cost? Here is a statement made up from the record and checked for accuracy, and it shows that instead of costing one and a half billion dollars they will cost less than \$800,000,000, at the outside figure, or approximately \$800,000,000 below what my friends on the Republican side have been telling you they would cost.

For the benefit of those who may want to scrutinize the matter further, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to put this statement in the Record as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

*Interior Department appropriation bill, fiscal year 1937*

UNITED STATES RECLAMATION PROJECTS NOT HERETOFORE CONSIDERED BY CONGRESS AND AUTHORIZED TO BE CONSTRUCTED BY SENATE AMENDMENT NO. 53

Project	Estimated total cost	Available from relief appropriation allocation	Appropriation for fiscal year 1937	Balance necessary to complete
Central Valley, Calif.	\$170,000,000	\$15,000,000	\$16,000,000	\$139,000,000
Carlsbad, N. Mex.	2,500,000	1,000,000	900,000	600,000
Deschutes, Oreg.	1,065,000	565,000	450,000	50,000
Provo River, Utah.	10,000,000	3,260,000	1,750,000	4,990,000
Yakima, Wash. (Roza Division)	14,446,600	6,813,000	2,500,000	5,133,600
Casper-Alcova, Wyo.	20,000,000	15,000,000	4,000,000	1,000,000
Total	218,011,600	41,638,000	25,600,000	
Total future commitments				150,773,600
Grand Lake-Big Thompson	22,000,000			22,000,000
Total				172,773,600

*Interior Department appropriation bill, fiscal year 1937—Continued*  
CONTINUATION OF CONSTRUCTION ON UNITED STATES RECLAMATION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Project	Estimated total cost	Heretofore appropriated or available from relief appropriation allocations	Appropriation for fiscal year 1937	Balance necessary to complete
Gila, Ariz.	\$20,500,000	\$2,075,000	\$2,500,000	\$15,925,000
Salt River, Ariz.	6,844,000	3,500,000	2,300,000	1,044,000
Grand Valley, Colo.	200,000		200,000	
Boise, Idaho	5,800,000	1,900,000	1,800,000	2,100,000
Boise (drainage)	200,000	40,000	160,000	
Owyhee, Oreg.	18,000,000	17,000,000	400,000	600,000
Riverton, Wyo.	8,670,000	4,900,000	900,000	2,870,000
Shoshone, Wyo.	6,500,000	1,500,000	1,000,000	4,000,000
Columbia Basin surveys (Washington) <sup>1</sup>	1,500,000	250,000	250,000	1,000,000
Grand Coulee Dam, Wash.	60,000,000	35,000,000	20,000,000	5,000,000
Total	128,214,000	66,165,000	29,510,000	
Total future commitments				32,539,000
Additional cost of high dam at Grand Coulee	58,575,000			
Grand Coulee power development, not authorized	67,425,000			
Total	126,000,000			

<sup>1</sup> The Columbia Basin project has not been authorized by law but surveys are authorized.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I also want to put in the Record a statement, a part of which I have read from, and I ask unanimous consent that that may be inserted as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Information regarding projects included in Senate Appropriation Committee's amendment to H. R. 10630

State and project	Expended and obligated	Total estimated cost	Legislative authority
Gila project, Arizona.	\$6,624	\$10,500,000	Boulder Canyon Project Act of Dec. 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057).
Salt River project, Arizona.	13,040,233	18,744,000	General provisions of reclamation law. Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and supplemental acts.
Central Valley project, California.	37,400	170,000,000	Sec. 1 of Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of Apr. 8, 1935.
Grand Valley project, Colorado.	\$5,017,500	\$5,217,500	General provisions of reclamation law. Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and supplemental acts.
Boise project, Idaho: Payette division—Drainage	16,326,327	22,580,000	Do.
Carlsbad project, New Mexico.	2,237,985	3,934,650	Do.
Deschutes project, Oregon. <sup>1</sup>	55,385	1,065,000	Surveys authorized by allotment under secs. 201, 202 of National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933. Construction by President's allocation under sec. 1 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of Apr. 8, 1935. Investigations also carried on with Reclamation funds.
Owyhee project, Oregon.	15,334,948	18,000,000	General provision of reclamation law. Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and supplemental acts.
Grand Coulee Dam project, Washington.	39,370,550	63,000,000	Sec. 2 of act of Aug. 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 102).
Columbia Basin project, Washington, economic surveys and investigations.	43,200		Surveys authorized by President's allocation under sec. 1 of Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of Apr. 8, 1935.
Yakima project, Washington (Roza division).	3,828,200	14,446,600	General provisions of reclamation law. Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and supplemental acts.
Provo River project, Utah.	87,723	10,000,000	Construction authorized by allotment made under secs. 201 and 202 of National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933; continued under President's allocation under sec. 1 of Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of Apr. 8, 1935. Investigated with Reclamation funds.

<sup>1</sup> Estimated cost stated is for construction of storage for supplemental water for lands now under irrigation. Bill has been proposed by Senator Steiwer for irrigation of lands in the north unit, which will require approximately \$6,000,000.



DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—continued  
Information regarding projects included in Senate Appropriation  
Committee's amendment to H. R. 10630—Continued

State and project	Expended and obligated	Total estimated cost	Legislative authority
Casper-Alcova project, Wyoming.	\$7,620,217	\$20,000,000	Construction authorized by allotment made under National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933; continued under President's allocation from Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of Apr. 8, 1935.
Riverton project, Wyoming.	4,819,216	8,670,000	General provisions of reclamation law. Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and supplemental acts.
Shoshone project, Wyoming.	635,580	6,500,000	General provisions of reclamation law. Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and supplemental acts.
Grand Lake, Big Thompson transmountain diversion, Colorado.	66,500	25,000,000	Surveys authorized by allotment made under National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. In this statement it is shown what the estimated cost is, what the moneys already allocated are, what the proposed appropriations for the fiscal year 1937 are, and the balance necessary to complete the projects. As I say, it will cost less than \$800,000,000, and that over a period, in the instance of the larger projects, of 40 years. We are not going to build these projects tomorrow. This money is to be spread out over a term of years, anywhere from 6 to 40 years. There is nothing frightening about that.

Now, I want to refer to a few statements made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. BUCHANAN]. He says he is a friend of reclamation. That was his opening statement. But he is in favor of reclamation, provided you do not reclaim anything. He is in favor of reclamation, provided you do not spend any money to reclaim land, according to his qualifying statement. He seemed to make the Grand Coulee project his pet aversion. He says it has not been authorized. In this he is also in error. I desire to call attention to section 2 of the river and harbor act enacted August 30, 1935. This is the language:

That for the purpose of controlling floods, improving navigation, regulating the flow of the streams of the United States, providing for storage and for the delivery of the stored waters thereof, for the reclamation of public lands and Indian reservations, and other beneficial uses, and for the generation of electric energy as a means of financially aiding and assisting such undertakings, the projects known as Parker Dam on the Colorado River and Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River, are hereby authorized and adopted, and all contracts and agreements which have been executed in connection therewith are hereby validated and ratified. \* \* \*

Can language be more emphatic or more comprehensive in conferring authority for the Grand Coulee project? At the time that ratification and authorization were made, to wit, August 30, 1935, the contract for the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam had been changed, under authority by the Secretary of the Interior from a low-dam structure to a high-dam structure, and that project is now being built on a high-dam basis, a basis of 500 feet, which would be absolutely necessary for a high dam, and would not be in conformity with the plans and specifications of a low dam.

It was that contract as modified by the Secretary of the Interior that was ratified in this act of 1935, the river and harbor bill. This is just one of the errors of the gentleman from Texas. I know he did not intend to make it. I have the utmost regard for him, and I know he did not mean to make this mistake, but I have told you what the situation is.

Who is going to pay back this money? Every economist who has been employed on this project, every report of the engineers who have investigated the project, both of the War Department and the Interior Department, say that this is a feasible project, not only from the standpoint of engineering but from a financial standpoint. They say this dam will generate 2,500,000 horsepower of electricity, which can be sold for 2½ mills per kilowatt-hour for the firm power at the bus board. In addition, it will generate secondary power

which can be sold at one-half of 1 mill per kilowatt-hour. You ask where we are going to get a market for this power. Mr. Page testified, and the record so shows, that within 19 years all this power would be absorbed; and the testimony of every economist and expert who has testified on the subject is that within 15 years not only would all the power of the Grand Coulee Dam be absorbed, but it was their most conservative estimate that at the end of 15 years the demand for additional power in the Pacific Northwest area would be at least twice that provided by the Grand Coulee Dam. There can be no question about a market for the power.

Let me remind you, furthermore, that when the Government builds the Grand Coulee Dam and the power plants, the Government will own the property. This property not only will pay back its cost, but after the cost is paid it will pay into the Treasury \$15,000,000 a year in net revenue. It will pay for itself in 30 years; and in 40 years' time there will be a surplus of \$168,000,000. It will not only pay for itself but it will continue to return to the Treasury for all time to come at least \$15,000,000 a year. In addition to that, the reclamation connected with the project in the course of 40 years will not only repay its share of the cost but will create wealth that will put into the Treasury of the United States \$10,000,000 a year in additional income taxes, money the Government is not now getting. The part I want to emphasize is that this dam and power plant will belong to the United States Government and will pay for itself over and over again.

The Grand Coulee Dam has been under construction for about 2 years. It is actually being built.

There has been allocated to this work—that is, for dam construction at the Grand Coulee project—\$35,000,000. The first \$15,000,000 was under the Public Works Act, and the additional \$20,000,000 was under the Emergency Relief Act appropriation, and that was an additional amount for carrying on the work that had been begun.

Contracts have been let. The main contract for the construction of the dam has been let for \$29,340,000 without materials. The Bureau of Reclamation, as the agent of the Government, is buying all the materials that go into the dam, and a total of \$60,000,000 has been either expended or obligated. That is the condition we have as to the contractual obligations of the Government in connection with this work.

The work is under way. A company, that we refer to for brevity as the M. W. A. K. Co., a combination of four construction companies that joined together for the purpose of bidding on this contract, is now engaged in the construction of the dam at Grand Coulee. They have projected their work to the point where they have cofferdams on both the east and west sides of the main stream of the river—that is, the shore ends of the dam—and they have excavated down to bedrock on both shore ends of the dam.

On the west side of the river they have carried the excavation to the point where they are actually pouring concrete and have been doing so for several months. So the dam is being built, the concrete is being put into the foundation of the dam.

At the east of the dam, on the east side of the river, there is a cofferdam work which is in progress, and the excavation is very far along on that end of the dam. It will be necessary to put in one additional cofferdam when the shore ends of the dam are built up to the point where they can, through openings, let the water of the river run out through the ends of the projected dam, and it will be necessary to put a cofferdam across the stream of the river and excavate that for the purpose of building that section of the dam.

The work has progressed to the point where they are several months ahead of the time estimated for the progress of the work.

Now, of course, it has been necessary, in getting ready for this work and get the materials in there, that the Bureau of Reclamation expend large sums of money. They have built a railroad of about 30 miles in length, leading from the Northern Pacific line up to the dam site. They



have built a bridge across the river, and many other expenditures have been made.

It will take probably 6 or 8 years to complete the entire structure. This is the first unit of the dam.

The contract now being executed is for the first unit of the dam structure.

When this dam is completed to its ultimate height it will increase the depth of the flow in the river which is immediately below the dam 6.9 feet, or approximately 7 feet, thus deepening the channel for navigation. About 100 miles below the dam it will increase the depth of the flow 5½ feet, and on down farther on the river at The Dalles, it will increase the depth of the flow 4.4 feet. It will increase the depth of the flow below the Bonneville Dam 3 feet.

I give you those figures so you may understand what it means for the navigation of the river. Ocean-going vessels at this time come up the Columbia River from the mouth as far as Portland, and above Portland, but they have to keep dredging the river in order to keep the channel open for the ocean-going vessels. This will aid, to the extent of 3 feet, the navigability of the river below the Bonneville Dam, and will improve navigation above Bonneville as indicated above.

The Grand Coulee Dam is the key structure for the development of the Columbia River. This dam will create a reservoir 150 miles long, extending clear back to the Canadian line and will so stabilize the flow of the water below that dam and that reservoir as to increase the potential firm electrical power at every proposed dam below it 100 percent, as far down as the Snake River, over what can otherwise be generated.

Below the mouth of the Snake River it will increase the firm power of electric energy to be generated at all dam sites below, including the Bonneville, 50 percent; and from the standpoint of power development and from the standpoint of navigation this improvement is justified. The Grand Coulee Dam will create a storage of more than 5,000,000 acre-feet.

And it follows, of course, that the holding back of these waters in the great reservoir behind the Grand Coulee Dam, extending back to the Canadian line, will control flood conditions in the river.

The engineers of the Reclamation Service have made a number of surveys at different times over a period of 15 or 20 years, and even further back than that, and they have studied closely the reports of the War Department Engineers and every engineering report that has been made upon this proposition in reference to the Columbia River Basin project pronounces the project feasible, not only from an engineering standpoint, but from a financial and an economic standpoint. There is no question about the feasibility of it from all of those standpoints, and all engineers have agreed upon that proposition.

There is no question about the feasibility of this project, and there is no question but that the money will be paid back. It is not going to put land under reclamation next year, or within 5 or 6 years. It will be at least 12 years before they will have any lands under reclamation, and then only a small portion. It will be 40 or 50 years before all of it will be under reclamation.

I could give you further details to show the desirability of this project, but have not time to do it. The fact is that we are not bringing an area of raw lands into cultivation. These lands have all been homesteaded. All of the tillable lands have been farmed, but on account of insufficient moisture for dry-farming operations these lands cannot be profitably farmed without irrigation. We must have this irrigation in order to take that land out of the marginal class and put it into the productive class so as to insure a living to those who farm it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Time for debate on these amendments has expired. The question is on the motion to recede.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to request the Chair to state the motion plainly and the effect of a vote one way or the other?

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot state the effect of the vote, but the Chair will be glad to state the proposition that is before the House.

Mr. BUCHANAN. A further parliamentary inquiry, if the Chair will permit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] moved to recede and concur with an amendment. On that motion I demanded a division. On the question to recede a vote "no" is equivalent to the House insisting upon its position.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 53.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado) there were—ayes 70, noes 113.

So the motion to recede was rejected.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 53.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 53.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 54. Page 76, immediately following amendment no. 53, insert:

"For continuation of the following projects in not to exceed the following amounts, respectively, to be expended in the same manner and for the same objects of expenditure as specified for projects included in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1937 under the caption 'Bureau of Reclamation', and to be reimbursable under the reclamation law.

"Gila project, Arizona, \$2,500,000;  
 "Salt River project, Arizona, \$2,300,000;  
 "Central Valley project, California, \$16,000,000;  
 "Grand Valley project, Colorado, \$200,000;  
 "Boise project, Idaho, Payette division, \$1,800,000;  
 "Boise project, Idaho, drainage, \$160,000;  
 "Carlsbad project, New Mexico, \$900,000;  
 "Deschutes project, Oregon, \$450,000;  
 "Owyhee project, Oregon, \$400,000;  
 "Grand Coulee Dam project, Washington, \$20,000,000;  
 "Columbia Basin project, Washington, economic surveys and investigations, \$250,000;  
 "Yakima project, Washington, Roza division, \$2,500,000;  
 "Provo River project, Utah, \$1,750,000;  
 "Casper-Alcova project, Wyoming, \$4,000,000;  
 "Riverton project, Wyoming, \$900,000;  
 "Shoshone project, Wyoming, Heart Mountain division, \$1,000,000;  
 "For administrative expenses on account of the above projects, including personal services and other expenses in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$2,500,000; in all, \$57,610,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the employment of personal services without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided further*, That of this amount not to exceed \$160,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 54.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 56: Page 79, line 14, insert "which amount shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia (not to exceed \$15,000) and in the field without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Colorado should tell us the effect of the provision with regard to civil service carried in this amendment. None of us



have copies of the amendments. I think the gentleman should tell us what it means, so that we may know what we are doing.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The object of this amendment of the Senate is to permit the Reclamation Service to carry on the work of building the All-American Canal by exempting the employees engaged in constructing the canal from the Classification Act and the civil-service laws. Otherwise it would cost a great deal more. They tell us it is not feasible to put these employees under civil service because they are largely day laborers, and it would not be economical or feasible to attempt to set up a civil-service register and give these employees a civil-service status.

Mr. SNELL. What explanation was given before the committee, or what evidence was given to show that it was not practical to take these men from the civil-service lists?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It is mostly day labor and manual work, not covered in the classified service. It is not civil-service work. It is a matter of relief, very largely.

Mr. SNELL. Is it relief for the general public or just relief for Democratic job hunters?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It is relief for thousands of day laborers who will be employed.

Mr. SNELL. Does this provision apply only to day laborers?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It applies, as I understand it, to practically all who may work on the canal.

Mr. SNELL. As I understand, it applies to everybody, including clerical help, and if there is any reason why clerical help should not come under the civil service I should like to have someone get up here and state it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. About 90 percent of this work is day labor.

Mr. SNELL. These laborers may be exempted, but the rest should be put under the civil service, as the President said they should be.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It was felt that it was not practical to do that, and we followed the wish of the Senate in that regard.

Mr. SNELL. Let us have a vote and find out about it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SNELL) there were—ayes 99, noes 60.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 83: Page 104, after line 7, insert: "Appomattox Court House National Historical Monument, Va.: For development and improvement in accordance with the provisions of the act approved August 13, 1935 (49 Stat. 613), to remain available until expended, \$100,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure until title to the land is acquired by the United States."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this calls for the expenditure of \$100,000 for a monument at Appomattox Court House. I do not think we ought to have any more monuments built right now, in view of the condition of the Treasury.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I may say this has been authorized by a special act of Congress and is simply carrying out a law that the House of Representatives and Senate have previously passed. It is in commemoration of a great historical event, and I feel it would be wrong to refuse to carry out the law.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] states that we should not have any more monuments

built. I think we should have a monument erected to designate the place where the Treasury used to be. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 84, noes 48.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 87: Page 111, after line 18, insert:

"For making surveys, studies, investigations, and reports regarding public, school, college, university, and other libraries; fostering coordination of public and school library service; coordinating library service on the national level with other forms of adult education; developing library participation in Federal projects; fostering Nation-wide coordination of research materials among the more scholarly libraries, inter-State library cooperation, and the development of public, school, and other library service throughout the country, and for the administrative expenses incident to performing these duties, including salaries of such assistants, experts, clerks, and other employees in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, as the Commissioner of Education may deem necessary, necessary traveling expenses, including attendance at meetings of educational associations, societies, and other organizations, purchase of miscellaneous supplies, equipment, stationery, typewriters, and exchange thereof, postage on foreign mail, purchase of books of reference, law books, and periodicals, printing and binding, and all other necessary expenses, \$40,000."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 87 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: "In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$25,000."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which the various motions offered in the consideration of the conference report were agreed to was laid on the table.

#### COLLECTION OF REVENUE ON INTOXICATING LIQUOR

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9185) to insure the collection of the revenue on intoxicating liquor, to provide for the more efficient and economical administration and enforcement of the laws relating to the taxation of intoxicating liquor, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection; and the Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL, Mr. CULLEN, Mr. BUCK, Mr. TREADWAY, and Mr. CROWTHER.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL—HELP THE FARMER—DEFEAT PROJECTS THAT WILL INCREASE PRODUCTION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, Congress is not going to adjourn, if it listens to the President, until a tax bill is passed which will enable the administration to balance the normal Budget. Our trouble has always been that as soon as provisions are made to balance the Budget, Congress finds a way to unbalance it. A striking example is this appropriation bill. If the amendments of the Senate prevail the Budget is not going to be balanced unless at least \$60,000,000 is added to the amount already requested by the President? Why? Because two Senate amendments which we are to vote on today call for appropriations for the next fiscal year of \$60,870,500, which is above the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget.

What was the purpose of enacting the Budget law? It was to keep our expenditures in normal times within the



receipts of the Government. We are not considering or talking about relief appropriations now but we are talking about the regular, or normal, expenditures of the Government.

The bill went to the Senate in excellent condition. The report of the House Committee on Appropriations—subcommittee on the Interior Department bill—shows it carried an amount \$1,721,111.70 below the amount the Director of the Budget said would be available during the next fiscal year to carry on the activities of the Department of the Interior. What happened in the Senate? There were 91 amendments, the great majority carrying increases in the appropriation. The conferees have agreed on all of the amendments but a few, and in reaching an agreement, if it was not for three items, amendments 24, 53, and 54, we would still be within the Budget estimates but above the amount the bill carried when passed by the House.

The first large item is \$3,710,500 for construction, repair, and rehabilitation of irrigation systems on Indian reservations. To one who reads of this item and does not fully understand its meaning there would be no cause for great alarm, but when the taxpayers know that the ultimate cost of completing the 13 projects provided for in 13 different States is \$26,900,000, then they will realize just what the Senate has done. This appropriation of less than \$4,000,000, in other words, is the starter, and the finish will come in future years when the balance of the \$26,900,000 is appropriated.

This, however, is but a drop in the bucket as compared with amendments 53 and 54. Those amendments provide for an immediate appropriation for the next fiscal year of \$57,160,000, as well as an authorization for construction of seven reclamation projects; the total cost to complete is admitted by the subcommittee to be \$703,000,000. This means that in years to follow you will be compelled to appropriate millions of dollars until the full amount of \$703,000,000 has been taken from the Treasury or the seven projects will not be completed.

You all know that in projects of this kind whenever they are started they are completed. Just start them with legislation of this character and next year the item will not be subject to a point of order, and if the committee is hostile any Member can offer an amendment from the floor. The two big projects are the Central Valley California project, for which the item provides \$16,000,000, and the Grand Coulee Dam project, in the State of Washington, for which \$20,000,000 is set aside for 1 year only.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of these improvements is to make land suitable for agricultural purposes. If one will read the organic act creating the Department of Agriculture he will find this Department was created for the purpose of promoting agriculture in its broadest sense. By the elimination of pests preying upon agricultural products, by extension work and research, the Department is expected to show the farmer how to raise better crops, cattle, and so forth, as well as increase the yield. This year the agriculture bill carried about \$50,000,000.

Here we have a great scientific department that has been of immense value to the farmers of the country. It is impossible to estimate its value in dollars and cents, but the Department has showed the farmer not only how to raise better crops but has greatly increased production—in fact, production increased to such an extent that it directly affected the price of what the farmer produced, there being a great surplus, the supply being far in excess of the demand, with the result that the price of agricultural products declined. To meet this situation we passed the A. A. A., and when the Supreme Court declared that act unconstitutional we passed the soil-conservation and domestic-allotment plan, the purpose of which was to conserve land against depletion by planting soil-building crops. By diverting the land to soil-building crops we would automatically reduce production, which meant a reduction of the surplus and a better price for that which the farmers produced. The appropriation for that purpose was \$450,000,000. The farmers who agreed to follow this plan would be reimbursed so much per

acre for planting soybeans, grass, and so forth, instead of corn, wheat, and so forth.

Here we have appropriations of \$500,000,000, about \$50,000,000 to show the farmers how to raise better and more crops, and \$450,000,000 to help the farmer reduce his yield. It just does not sound right. But what happens if we pass these amendments? The completion of the projects inserted by the Senate, and which we will vote on today, means that millions and millions of new land will be open for agricultural purposes. If we are going to reduce the surplus by paying farmers to take land out of cultivation, how can we justify the expenditure of nearly a billion dollars to provide more land to raise additional crops? Why, in the end there is but one answer; we are but further increasing the surplus, and we will destroy the farmers of the country, who are now so hard pressed, and who for years, or until the passage of the laws I referred to, were unable to secure even the cost of production for their crops and cattle, and so forth.

I want to help the farmer, and it seems to me that every friend of the farmer in this House should vote down the Senate amendments. By so doing we will be protecting the men whom we all have been so anxious to assist. If production was below the demand, then I would say, yes, let us find new land to raise more crops, but that situation does not exist. It is just the reverse. I feel every farmer in this country who is deep in debt will be grateful to those who will vote down the Senate amendments.

#### COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES IN COMMEMORATION OF SIR WALTER RALEIGH'S COLONY

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 12799) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Sir Walter Raleigh's Colony on Roanoke Island, N. C., known in history as the "Lost Colony", and the birth of Virginia Dare, the first child of English parentage to be born on the American Continent, and her baptism.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if we have a few more of these bills I am going to make a speech in favor of every one of them. I have been overruled so many times that I will not object to this one.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina that this is the thirty-fifth bill that has been presented to Congress requesting the coinage of silver money for some kind of a show. I think we have begun the Democratic administration's inflation measure through this channel. I believe the Democrats ought to be careful now that they do not do something they will be sorry for.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in commemoration of the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Sir Walter Raleigh's colony on Roanoke Island, N. C., known in history as the Lost Colony, and the birth of Virginia Dare, the first child of English parentage to be born on the American Continent, and her baptism, there shall be coined at a mint of the United States to be designated by the Director of the Mint not less than 25,000 silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and composition and of a specially prepared design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for this coinage.

Sec. 2. The coins herein authorized shall bear date 1937, irrespective of the year in which they are minted or issued, shall be legal tender in any payment to the amount of their face value, and shall be issued only upon the request of the Roanoke Colony Memorial Association of Manteo, N. C., upon payment by it of the par value of such coins, but not less than 25,000 such coins shall be issued to it at any one time, and no such coins shall be issued after July 1, 1937. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by the Roanoke Colony Memorial Association of Manteo, N. C., and the net proceeds shall be used by it in defraying the expenses incidental and appropriate to the commemoration of such event.

Sec. 3. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same, regulating and guarding the process of coinage, providing for the



purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for the security of the coins, or for any other purposes, whether such laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks previously made by me this afternoon a letter from the Secretary of State about Japanese competition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT—INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a table prepared by the Department of Agriculture applicable to the discussion today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, support of amendments nos. 53 and 54 is impossible. Taken together, the two amendments contemplate the expenditure of further and enormous sums of money for a reclamation program in the Far West without precedent. They contemplate this expenditure running into hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars despite the fact that the Treasury is confronted by unparalleled deficits. They contemplate a great

increase in available acreage for crops running into hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of acres despite the fact that we are spending vast sums to bring about a material reduction in acreage available for crops. Furthermore, no opportunity is afforded for proper consideration of either amendment.

Amendment no. 53 is in reality seven amendments in one. It contemplates the authorization of seven great reclamation projects not heretofore authorized. We are compelled to approve or disapprove of these seven amendments as a unit.

Amendment no. 54 is in reality 16 amendments in one. It contemplates the appropriation of almost \$60,000,000 for 16 separate reclamation projects. We are compelled to vote for or against all 16 appropriations as a unit.

We are asked to authorize seven great projects, no one of which has received consideration by any legislative committee of either House, no one of which can be subjected at this time to individual consideration on its merits.

We are asked to appropriate \$57,610,000 for 16 great projects, in respect to the ultimate cost of which there appears to be no accurate information. The lowest estimate submitted amounts to some \$700,000,000. It seems more probable that the figure will prove to be at least a billion and a half dollars.

Under our reclamation policy, some 4,000,000 acres of land have been made available for cultivation. Some \$2,000,000,000 worth of crops have been harvested on this land. In no State directly affected by the proposed projects is there anything like a 100-percent utilization of land available for crops. The following table, furnished by the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, indicates the figures employed by the Department in respect to land utilization for each of the States in question in 1934:

	Arizona	California	Colorado	Idaho	New Mexico	Oregon	Utah	Washington	Wyoming
1934									
Crops harvested.....acres.....	488,685	6,578,724	3,852,348	2,668,685	743,840	2,831,742	814,854	3,635,796	1,220,354
Crop failure.....do.....	50,352	459,505	3,389,152	319,419	1,222,601	280,426	358,177	97,303	552,078
Crop land idle.....do.....	150,207	1,625,097	1,599,162	943,686	421,447	1,085,286	332,088	2,437,743	367,765
Plowable pasture.....do.....	159,940	2,967,526	2,807,174	352,806	2,930,982	723,585	201,055	572,979	1,301,391
Available for crops.....do.....	849,184	11,630,852	11,647,836	4,284,596	5,318,870	4,921,039	1,706,174	6,743,821	3,441,588
Crops harvested.....do.....	488,685	6,578,724	3,852,348	2,668,685	743,840	2,831,742	814,854	3,635,796	1,220,354
Crop failure.....do.....	50,352	459,505	3,389,152	319,419	1,222,601	280,426	358,177	97,303	552,078
Under cultivation.....do.....	539,037	7,038,229	7,241,500	2,988,104	1,966,441	3,112,168	1,173,031	3,733,099	1,772,432
Percentage the land under cultivation was of the land available for crops.....	63.5	60.5	62.2	69.7	37.0	63.2	68.8	55.4	51.5

The utilization in one instance—New Mexico—is less than 38 percent.

Nevertheless, the program contemplated would make available for cultivation or increased cultivation hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of acres of land. The Bureau of Reclamation uses the figure 1,200,000 acres. The additional acreage would frequently be made available at an excessive cost per acre and despite the fact that we have been spending about a half billion dollars a year under the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the so-called Soil Erosion Act to take from thirty to thirty-five millions of acres out of cultivation.

Testifying recently before the independent offices appropriation subcommittee of the House, Mr. Chester A. Davis, former Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, suggested that for every additional acre brought into cultivation an acre should be taken out of cultivation.

The enormous expenditure involved in the program can only be appreciated by study of the individual items.

The Grand Coulee project, in Washington, for example, in respect to which an additional appropriation of \$20,000,000 is requested, involves an ultimate expenditure, now estimated by the Reclamation Bureau as amounting to \$389,000,000. I am advised that the Board of Engineers has estimated the cost in the past at some \$711,000,000. The project had strong opposition for years. It appears to be indefensible as an irrigation project. Justification is urged in the light of anticipated power development which admittedly cannot be fully utilized for some 19 years to come.

The Central Valley project, in California, for which \$16,000,000 is requested, involves an ultimate expenditure which has been estimated all the way from \$170,000,000 to over \$600,000,000, according to figures of the California State engineer. The original proposal contemplated State financing with Federal contribution to the extent of \$12,000,000 for flood control and navigation. The present proposal contemplates financing in full by the Federal Government.

The Gila project, in Arizona, for which \$2,500,000 is requested involves an ultimate expenditure estimated at \$125,000,000. In the past the project has been strongly opposed by the Department of Agriculture due to conditions of soil and climate.

The Grand Lake-Big Thompson project in Colorado, for which authorization is requested involves an ultimate expenditure estimated at from twenty-five to fifty million dollars. This project involves a tunnel 12½ miles long under the Continental Divide, to carry some 361,000 acre-feet per year from the west to the east side of the Divide. Authorization is requested despite the fact that surveys have not yet been completed. Strong opposition has been presented by informed individuals and associations all over the country because of the cost involved, because of the damage to Rocky Mountain National Park and because of the departure from established National Park policy excluding commercial undertaking from all parks.

The Casper-Alcova project in Wyoming, in respect to which \$4,000,000 is requested, contemplates an ultimate expenditure of \$20,000,000. The project appears to be inde-



fensible as an irrigation project requiring some \$600 per acre for additional land made available for cultivation. Justification is urged on the basis of charging a portion of the expenditure only to irrigation, the balance to power.

These are but examples. The cost is enormous. Detailed justification for major projects is lacking.

I am not opposed to reclamation—I realize fully from personal observation throughout the West the vital part that reclamation has played in the life of the Nation. But I am opposed to reclamation in the absence of demonstrated need and demonstrated feasibility. I am opposed to a procedure which denies consideration of individual reclamation projects—which compels consideration of 7 or 16 great projects as a unit. And I am opposed to a policy which proposes with one hand to make available hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of additional acres of land for cultivation while with the other hand it takes millions of acres of land out of cultivation.

To vote for amendments nos. 53 and 54 is to vote to commit the Federal Government to a gigantic reclamation program without proper consideration and without adequate justification at a time when we are still pursuing a policy of crop restriction, at a time when the Nation is confronted by an amazing deficit amounting to upwards of \$6,000,000,000.

WHY A LIFELONG DEMOCRAT, A FORMER MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE, CANNOT SUPPORT THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short statement by former Senator Bruce, of Maryland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and at the suggestion of the author, I include the following statement made in a letter addressed to the New York Sun by Hon. William Cabell Bruce, a lifelong Democrat and from 1923 to 1929 a distinguished Member of the United States Senate from the State of Maryland:

In his address last Thursday night at the State convention of the Young Democratic Clubs, Senator TYDINGS truly said, with reference to the next Presidential election: "There are only three courses open. We can support the Democratic ticket, we can support the Republican ticket, or we can take a walk."

Speaking for myself, as an individual Democrat, I wish to say that when Mr. Roosevelt comes up for reelection I shall certainly not "take a walk"; never, since I became old enough to vote, having failed to exercise the privilege of voting at a Presidential election or of frankly announcing, before I did so, for what Presidential candidate I intended to vote, I shall certainly, too, not cast my ballot for Mr. Roosevelt.

#### AGREES WITH FAMOUS DOCTOR

In my conception of him I have come around to the view held of him by one of the most famous physicians in the history of Baltimore, who before the last Presidential election said to me: "I have always been a Democrat, as you know, but I cannot vote for Roosevelt. I was frequently brought into contact with him at Harvard, and I just do not think that he has the practical sense to be President of the United States."

In my humble judgment Mr. Roosevelt as President has proved himself to be a shallow, impressionable, volatile man, inspired by good intentions and possessed of a very pleasing presence, but conspicuously deficient in all the higher qualifications for the office of President.

Therefore, pursuing Senator TYDINGS' alternatives, there is nothing for me to do except to vote at the next Presidential election for Mr. Roosevelt's Republican opponent; and this I expect confidently to do, for, be the latter's shortcomings what they may, it is inconceivable within the range of reasonable probability, as I see it, that they could produce such lamentable results as have marked the Presidential career of Mr. Roosevelt; that is to say, disregard of all the ordinary principles of prudential calculation and foresight in the field of Federal revenue and expenditure; inane and visionary industrial and social planning which, in several flagrant instances, has been held by the Supreme Court of the United States to have violated time-honored American principles of local self-government and individual freedom; loss of morale on the part of thousands of human beings, bred by extravagant and ill-conceived programs of governmental relief; the crack-brained vagaries of radical agitators, resolved to go Mr. Roosevelt one better; insurrectionary class prejudice and violence, such as only a day or so ago incited a labor leader in New York to threaten "to tear down" that city if the demands of his following were not

conceded; the resuscitation on a vast scale of the detestable system of spoils politics in the province of the Federal Government which the Federal merit system of appointment, under the fostering care of Grover Cleveland and every subsequent President of the United States, Democratic or Republican, with the exception of Mr. Roosevelt, has done so much to rebuke and keep within bounds; and invasions of the legislative authority of Congress by Executive authority which lead directly in the end to the dictatorship of a Hitler, a Mussolini, or a Stalin.

#### BRINGS IN CLASSIC FABLE

When I think of the vast horde of subordinate officeholders, imposed by Mr. Roosevelt, with Mr. Farley at his elbow, on the Federal civil service, without the slightest heed to the salutary principle of nonpartisan, competitive examination, which governs appointments, covered by the Federal merit system of appointments, I cannot but recall the celebrated declaration of Lord Melbourne that he was partial to the English Order of the Garter because there was "no damned nonsense of merit" about it.

The classic fable tells us that no sooner had Phaeton received from his father the reins, with which the chariot of the Sun was controlled, than he betrayed his ignorance and incapacity to guide the chariot. The result was a menace to heaven and earth, which did not come to an end until Jupiter struck Phaeton with one of his thunderbolts and hurled him headlong from heaven into the River Po. Only short of the thunderbolt of popular wrath at a Presidential election does the monstrous system of artificial administration, built up by Mr. Roosevelt, seem now to have arrived.

#### THOUSANDS ADDED TO PAY ROLL

Our country is, unquestionably, recovering, to a noticeable extent, from the worst effects of our last great economic crisis. It has always recovered from such crises; but, undeniably, the principal thing from which it has to recover is Mr. Roosevelt himself. He seems as powerless to control his chariot as Phaeton was to control his.

Only recently thousands of more officeholders have been added to the pay roll of the Federal Government; the relief load of our country, in January 1936, was about what it was in January 1935, and it is claimed by the American Federation of Labor that the rise in unemployment in December-January last was the highest, in that period, in the last 5 years.

#### NATIONAL DEBT INCREASING

Our national debt is still steadily increasing, and new tax thumb-screws are being devised to rack still further the tortured limbs of the hapless American taxpayer. In the face of such conditions as these, we cannot hope that the economic recovery, which is now under way, can do more than progress haltingly until another thunderbolt is hurled, and another rash chariot driver, like Phaeton, is cast, not into the Po, but into the Potomac.

By pen, tongue, and, to the extent of my ability, by purse, I did all in my power to bring about the defeat of William J. Bryan, whose election as President would, in my opinion, have been of much less pernicious moment to the happiness and welfare of the people of the United States than would be the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt. If I am living in November 1936 I shall assuredly follow, in relation to Mr. Roosevelt, the example which I set myself in relation to Bryan—the only candidate of the Democratic Party for the Presidency against whom I have ever voted.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ADAIR (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON), indefinitely, on account of illness.

#### BAYOU ST. JOHN, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a bill which is an emergency matter (H. R. 11792) declaring Bayou St. John, in the city of New Orleans, La., a nonnavigable stream.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this bill?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It is a bill to declare a bayou that runs within the city of New Orleans a nonnavigable stream in order that some worth-while W. P. A. projects, such as the building of bridges across it, may be commenced. There is no opposition to the measure.

Mr. RICH. I may say to my colleagues that they are hunting everything under the sun to spend W. P. A. money on, and, goodness knows, if we are going to have to continue this, we might as well do so in New Orleans as anywhere else.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Bayou St. John, in the city of New Orleans, La., be, and the same is hereby, declared to be not a navigable water of the United States within the meaning of the laws enacted by Congress for the preservation and protection of such waters.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.



The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, Bayou St. John extends southward 3.9 miles into the city of New Orleans from Lake Pontchartrain. It is generally from 100 to 170 feet in width and has a depth of from 6 to 11 feet, except near the entrance, which is obstructed by a wide bar. The bayou and an artificial extension 8,000 feet long, named the Carondelet Canal, was operated as a toll waterway for over a century prior to 1908. The Carondelet Canal was closed to navigation in 1908 and has since been acquired and partly filled by the State. The bayou is not under improvement by the United States. Commerce on the bayou has declined since the closure of the Carondelet Canal, and in 1934 was limited to the movement of 1,900 tons of lumber. With the exception of a few small lots, the entire area near the bayou has been zoned by the city for residential purposes and the most of the left bank is controlled by the city and reserved for park development. The only industry of any consequence along the waterway are two small boat repair shops near its upper end and a lumberyard below Esplanade Avenue. Esplanade Avenue crosses the bayou nine-tenths of a mile below its head. Because of the immaterial value of Bayou St. John above Esplanade Avenue as a highway of commerce for trade and travel by water, the War Department has no objection, as far as the general interests of navigation are concerned, to this bill, H. R. 11792.

Under municipal ordinance by the Commission Council of New Orleans adopted in 1934, Bayou St. John above Esplanade Avenue is to be used as an aquatic park. With the passage of this bill, the bridging of the bayou at or near Demourelle Island will be done without having to take into account the requirements of navigation, and also permit the elimination of the lift span from the Esplanade Avenue Bridge. It is the intention of the commission council to erect a new concrete arched pedestrian and vehicular bridge across Bayou St. John at Esplanade Avenue, sufficiently wide for four lanes of traffic and pedestrian walks on both sides. A check revealed that more than 10,000 vehicles passed over the present lift bridge a day and more than 2,000 pedestrians and cyclists used it daily during a 3-day period.

The Commission Council of the City of New Orleans, March 19, 1936, unanimously adopted a motion going on record in favor of the action taken to approve the bill as introduced by me and instructed the city engineer to prepare report to show what extreme cost and inconvenience it would be to the people of New Orleans if the bill is not adopted, and that it is for the public welfare of the people of that city that the bill be enacted into law.

The city park board, through the W. P. A., has dedicated 10 acres near the lake end of the park to a public yacht basin, tying in with Bayou St. John, which will remove all necessity for pleasure boats to moor in Bayou St. John. The basin will be provided with all modern sanitary facilities and work will commence promptly.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make the announcement, if it is permissible under the rules, that the Members who are on the Bell investigating committee were absent yesterday on four roll calls. They desire to have it explained and noted in the RECORD that they were absent because of attendance upon their official duties in connection with that committee.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 560. An act for the relief of the Western Electric Co., Inc.;

S. 760. An act for the relief of Harry P. Hollidge;

S. 952. An act for the relief of Zelma Halverson;

S. 1186. An act for the relief of Frank P. Ross;

S. 1328. An act for the relief of the Snare & Triest Co., now Frederick Snare Corporation;

S. 1431. An act for the relief of the Collier Manufacturing Co., of Barnesville, Ga.;

S. 1490. An act for the relief of Earl A. Ross;

S. 2520. An act for the relief of T. D. Randall & Co.;

S. 2734. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of Henry W. Bibus, Annie Ulrick, Samuel Henry, Charles W. Hensor, Headley Woolston, John Henry, estate of Harry B. C. Margerum, and George H. Custer, of Falls Township and borough of Tullytown, Bucks County, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

S. 4317. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the city of Buffalo, N. Y., the right and privilege to occupy and use for sewage-disposal facilities part of the lands forming the pier and dikes of the Black Rock Harbor improvement at Buffalo, N. Y.; and

S. 4594. An act to supplement the act of June 25, 1929 (ch. 41, 46 Stat. L. 41), which authorized and directed the Attorney General to institute suit against the Northern Pacific Railway Co. and others.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2982. An act for the relief of Sarah Shelton;

H. R. 7110. An act to authorize the President to bestow the Navy Cross upon Brig. Gen. Robert H. Dunlap, United States Marine Corps, deceased;

H. R. 8262. An act for the relief of Tom Rogers, and the heirs of W. A. Bell, Israel Walker, Henry Shaw, Thomas Bailey, and Joseph Watson;

H. R. 8287. An act to establish an assessed valuation real property tax in the Virgin Islands of the United States;

H. R. 8372. An act to authorize the acquisition of lands in the vicinity of Miami, Fla., as a site for a naval air station and to authorize the construction and installation of a naval air station thereon;

H. R. 8431. An act to provide for the establishment of the Fort Frederica National Monument, at St. Simon Island, Ga., and for other purposes;

H. R. 8784. An act to authorize withholding compensation due Government personnel;

H. R. 9995. An act to grant a renewal of patent no. 59560, relating to the emblem of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War;

H. R. 10194. An act granting a renewal of patent no. 40029, relating to the badge of the Holy Name Society;

H. R. 10267. An act to provide for adjusting the compensation of division superintendents, assistant division superintendents, assistant superintendents at large, assistant superintendent in charge of car construction, chief clerks, assistant chief clerk, and clerks in charge of sections in offices of division superintendents in the Railway Mail Service, to correspond to the rates established by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and

H. R. 10934. An act to authorize the transfer of the customhouse at Salem, Mass., from the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department to the Department of the Interior.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 21, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.



## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

839. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to House Resolution 296, dated August 7, 1935, information concerning the number and distribution of Federal institutions and establishments of every kind and character which are depositing or causing to be deposited raw, untreated sewage into navigable or nonnavigable waters of the United States, and such recommendations with respect thereto as is deemed advisable and in the public interest (H. Doc. No. 495); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

840. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists of papers among the archives and records of the Veterans' Administration which the Administration has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers.

841. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists of papers among the archives and records of the Federal Trade Commission which the Commission has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers.

842. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers among the archives and records of the Federal Reserve Board which the Board has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers.

843. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers among the archives and records of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission which the Commission has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers.

844. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists of papers among the archives and records of the Civil Service Commission which the Commission has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers.

845. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists of papers among the archives and records of the Department of Commerce which the Department has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers.

846. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists of papers among the archives and records of the Department of Agriculture which the Department has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers.

847. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists of papers among the archives and records of the Post Office Department which the Department has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers.

848. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers among the archives and records of the Department of War which the Department has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers.

849. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists of papers among the archives and records of the Department of the Treasury which the Department has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers.

850. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers among the archives and records of the Department of State which the Department has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. GILLETTE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 4584. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of July 3, 1918 (40 Stat. 755), to extend and adapt its provisions to the convention between the United States and the United Mexican States for the protection of migratory birds and game mammals concluded at the City of Mexico, February 7, 1936, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2692). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CASTELLOW: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 12257. A bill to extend the jurisdiction of the United States Court for China to offenses committed on the high seas; without amendment (Rept. No. 2693). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 563. Joint resolution to declare December 26, 1936, a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2694). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1976. An act to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, and for other purposes", approved April 15, 1926, so as to equalize the allowances for quarters and subsistence of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 2696). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 10669. A bill authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Sac and Fox Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma; without amendment (Rept. No. 2697). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. S. 81. An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts by the Department of Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 2698). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JONES: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 11929. A bill granting to the State of Iowa for State park purposes certain land of the United States in Clayton County, Iowa; without amendment (Rept. No. 2699). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAINES: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 6868. A bill to provide time credits for substitutes in the motor-vehicle service; with amendment (Rept. No. 2724). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 12646. A bill to amend section 318 of the Communications Act of 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 2725). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 11325. A bill to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2727). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 3992. An act for the relief of Capt. Laurence V. Houston, retired; without amendment (Rept. No. 2695). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.



Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1367. A bill for the relief of William A. McMahan; with amendment (Rept. No. 2700). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2323. A bill for the relief of Dean Scott; with amendment (Rept. No. 2701). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2932. A bill for the relief of the International-Great Northern Railroad Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2702). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7822. A bill for the relief of Lucretia Norris; with amendment (Rept. No. 2703). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7947. A bill for the relief of Rev. Harry J. Hill; with amendment (Rept. No. 2704). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7970. A bill for the relief of V. P. Johnson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2705). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8643. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Daley; with amendment (Rept. No. 2706). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SOUTH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8841. A bill for the relief of Estelle Mary MacDonald and Marilyn MacDonald; with amendment (Rept. No. 2707). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8898. A bill for the relief of Barbara Jean Matthews, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 2708). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9237. A bill for the relief of Annie E. Hyland; with amendment (Rept. No. 2709). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9418. A bill for the relief of Edward L. Gockeler; with amendment (Rept. No. 2710). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GWYNNE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9896. A bill for the relief of Andrew Dowd; with amendment (Rept. No. 2711). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SOUTH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10169. A bill for the relief of L. M. Crawford; with amendment (Rept. No. 2712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10222. A bill for the relief of Sarah E. Palmer; with amendment (Rept. No. 2713). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10527. A bill for the relief of Harris Bros. Plumbing Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2714). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10677. A bill for the relief of Cora Fulghum and Ben Peterson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2715). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EKWALL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10697. A bill for the relief of George Houston; with amendment (Rept. No. 2716). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11203. A bill for the relief of Andrew Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 2717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11461. A bill for the relief of the estates of N. G. Harper and Amos Phillips; with amendment (Rept. No. 2718). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11868. A bill for the relief of Brook House, Ltd., of Sydney, Australia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2719). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. House Joint Resolution 522. Joint resolution for the relief of William W. Brunswick; with amendment (Rept. No. 2720). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. S. 3861. An act for the relief of the Alaska Commercial Co., of San Francisco, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2721). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 4358. An act for the relief of Harry L. Parker; without amendment (Rept. No. 2722). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 4359. An act for the relief of W. D. Reed; without amendment (Rept. No. 2723). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 12788. A bill for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2726). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DeROUEN: A bill (H. R. 12789) to authorize the exchange of certain lands within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park for lands within the Cherokee Indian Reservation, N. C., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. EKWALL: A bill (H. R. 12790) to authorize completion, maintenance, and operation of certain facilities for navigation on the Columbia River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 12791) to fulfill certain treaty obligations with respect to water levels of the Lake of the Woods; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12792) to prohibit the commercial use of the coat of arms of the Swiss Confederation pursuant to the obligation of the Government of the United States under article 28 of the Red Cross Convention signed at Geneva July 27, 1929; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 12793) to amend certain administrative provisions of the internal-revenue laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. O'DAY: A bill (H. R. 12794) to extend the definition of an alien veteran, for naturalization purposes only, so as to include certain alien enemies and nationals of Turkey and Bulgaria who rendered active service in United States armed forces with personal record of loyalty to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COFFEE: A bill (H. R. 12795) to provide that certain taxes with respect to coconut oil be covered into the general funds of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY: A bill (H. R. 12796) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the times and places for holding court for the eastern district of North Carolina", approved May 10, 1928, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 28, sec. 179; U. S. C., Supp. I, title 28, sec. 179); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 12797) to include native-born Filipinos for eligibility under the naturalization laws, as amended, who served during the World War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HILDEBRANDT: A bill (H. R. 12798) to amend section 673, chapter 17, title 28, Judicial Code of the United States Statutes, edition of December 6, 1926; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARREN: A bill (H. R. 12799) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Sir Walter Raleigh's colony on Roanoke Island, N. C., known in history as the Lost Colony, and the birth of Virginia Dare, the first child of English parentage to be born on the American Continent, and her baptism; to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.



By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 12800) to regulate interstate commerce in bituminous coal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLANTON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 592) making appropriations for support of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 12788) for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AYERS: A bill (H. R. 12801) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Waterton Oil, Land & Power Co., of Butte, Mont., against the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARMICHAEL: A bill (H. R. 12802) for the relief of Edna Lee Fuqua and Vernedia Eggleston Fuqua; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12803) for the relief of Howard Fuqua; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12804) for the relief of the estates of Cleoney Fuqua and Miles Moore; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 12805) for the relief of the Nafra Co., Inc., and to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, consider, and render judgment on certain claims of the Nafra Co., Inc., against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GINGERY: A bill (H. R. 12806) for the relief of James P. McDonnell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12807) for the relief of Walter Francis Meinhart; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LEE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 12808) for the relief of William E. Burch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 12809) granting a pension to Willie D. Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHULTE: A bill (H. R. 12810) granting a pension to Simon R. Ditzler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 12811) for the relief of the Kanawha Valley Coal Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 12812) granting an increase of pension to Mary Catherine Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TONRY: A bill (H. R. 12813) for the relief of Georg Ferdinand Erich Emmrich, also known as Richard Shultz; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10919. By Mr. DE ROUEN: Petition of Bayou Plaquemine Gravity Drainage District No. 12, of St. Landry Parish, La., urging the favorable consideration by the House of Senate bill 630; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10920. By Mr. DARROW: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, protesting against the enactment of the Healey bill (H. R. 11554); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10921. Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, protesting against the enactment of House bill 12395, the revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10922. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Mamie Cerf; Joe Jolesch; Charles S. Cook; F. B. Vrla; J. W. Tolleson, president, the Citizens National Bank, of Ennis; E. C. Hawkins, vice president of Ennis State Bank; W. F. Templeton; and Ernest L. Raphael, all of Ennis, Tex., favoring Senate Joint Resolution 205, by Mr. SMITH; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10923. Also, petition of Mrs. G. L. Austin, Mrs. Roy Brown, Mrs. S. N. Brown, Mrs. J. M. Thompson, W. C. Norris, J. B. Adkins, and a large number of other citizens, all of Navarro County, Tex., favoring House bill 7122; to the Committee on Pensions.

10924. By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: Petition of H. H. Warner, 1505 Washington Street; J. F. Inglesby, 404 East Park Avenue; and other railroad employees, of Savannah, Ga., protesting against taxes authorized by House bill 8651, known as Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, and House bill 8652, known as "An act to levy excise tax upon carriers and income tax upon their employees"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10925. By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of the Democratic Educational Group (a club of 800 members), requesting the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads in the United States Senate to strongly urge the next Congress to enact a law providing for a 30-hour week for all postal and other Federal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10926. Also, petition of the Federation of Citizens' Associations, Central Labor Union (representing organized labor in the District of Columbia), and the Southwest Citizens' Association, endorsing the Scott resolution, No. 486, and petitioning the Speaker to appoint a committee of five select Members to investigate fatalities and injuries in the District of Columbia, to inquire into elevator accidents, set standard qualifications for elevator inspection, investigate office of building inspector, examine plan to establish self-supporting elevator-inspection department, to determine whether or not investigation of accidents conducted by building inspectors have a tendency to excuse improper performance of duty, to report to the House the results of its investigations, that congressional committees of investigation be requested to make special study of antiquated elevators in District Building; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10927. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of citizens of Raleigh County, W. Va., urging the enactment of pending antilynch legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10928. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of New Brunswick, N. J., that the United States Senate enact the United States Housing Act of 1936, being Senate bill No. 4424, introduced by Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, and that the House of Representatives enact the identical measure introduced in the House by Congressman HENRY ELLENBOGEN and being House bill 12164; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10929. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring the permanency of the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10930. Also, petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, relative to affording the privilege of entry into this country to those persons who are being persecuted and discriminated against in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10931. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Boonville Press Club, Boonville, Ind.; to the Committee on the Library.

10932. Also, petition of the city of New Brunswick, N. J.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1936

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 12, 1936)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, May 20, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.